

CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of Meeting of September 17, 2008

Commissioners Present: Staci Blatt, Ralph Freeman (Chair), George Henry, Barbara McCoy, John Ogletree, Larry Phillips, Brook Tate, Jo Tyler

Commissioners Absent: Bette Carter

Staff Present: Sue Anderson, Planning Director; Lu Ann Welter, Administrative Assistant

I Call to Order. The Chair called the monthly meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:00 p.m.

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

III Minutes. *On motion of Commissioner McCoy, seconded by Commissioner Tyler, the minutes of August 20, 2008 were approved.*

IV Bruce and Carolyn Evans (H08-43-COA) After swearing in potential witnesses for all three hearings, the Chair opened this public hearing. At the request of Sue Anderson, Planning Director, Commission File No. H08-43-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. Ms. Anderson gave the following background on this application:

The Planning Department is in receipt of an application for a certificate of appropriateness from Bruce and Carolyn Evans to undertake the following work at 1032 Patton Street:

Install vinyl replacement windows at side and rear of house.

Since the proposed project includes alterations to an architectural detail where there is a change from the original or existing materials, they are considered "major works." An application for a certificate of appropriateness for a major work must be reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).

The subject property is listed as **contributing property** in the *Hyman Heights Local Designation Report*. The property is described as:

1032 Patton Street Built ca. 1920 and in good condition. This front gable bungalow has German siding, twelve-over-one windows, and a front gable porch. The porch is supported by heavy, battered piers on brick pedestals.

The subject property and accessory garage structure are listed as **contributing** on the National Register and described as:

1032 Patton Street. Harry E. Katzenmoyer House. Contributing. by 1922.

Bungalow style one-story plus basement house with a front gable roof. Deck added at rear. Walls are German siding. Attached front porch with battered posts on brick piers, and brick steps. Windows are twelve-over-one with some casement windows in the basement. Replacement front door with transom window above.

In July of 2008, staff approved a minor work to remove two dead trees

The applicant proposes to replace four windows at the side and rear of the house. The windows will be vinyl and will be 12 over one to match the existing windows on the house, which are replacement windows done prior to the owner purchasing the house. These are shown as #3 on the attached drawing.

The applicant also proposes to rearrange windows on the sun porch to accommodate internal remodeling of the house (shown as #5 on the attached drawing). Additionally, a small window will be removed on the sun porch (#4 on attached drawing). The applicant has indicated that they will match the existing siding for the areas that they are rearranging the windows and removing the one window.

The applicant did not meet with the Design Review Advisory Committee.

Carolyn Evans, of 1032 Patton Street, explained there are 36 windows in the house and 32 have already been replaced. The four remaining windows on the back sides of the house are the only ones not replaced. Mr. Ogletree asked if the replaced windows were all vinyl. Ms. Evans said yes, the sashes are wood with vinyl inserts. She said the front porch windows are the only replacement windows to still have the 12 over 1 mullions. The Chair asked if the windows on the side were 12 over 1 or 1 over 1. Ms. Evens said both. Commissioner Tyler asked if she was planning on centering the windows on the back sun porch. Ms. Evans said the center window would be removed. Commissioner Tate asked why cedar shakes on the back of the house. Ms. Evans said they hoped to use the removed wood siding for repair in other areas and the cedar shakes would only be from the upper windows sills up. Commissioner Tate asked if there were cedar shakes anywhere else on the house. Ms. Evans said no. The Chair asked what type of siding was on the house. Ms. Evans said German wood siding. The Chair asked if it were eight or ten inches wide. Ms. Evans said she wasn't sure. The Chair said eight inch siding can be brought easily and ten inch can be ordered. Commission Tyler asked if the cedar siding would be on all three sides of the sun porch. Ms. Evans said yes. Commissioner Henry asked if she had to have cedar. Ms. Evens said no.

The Chair asked if anyone else would like to speak. The Chair closed the public hearing.

The Chair said he would like to see mullions either eight or twelve in the new windows and would not like to introduce new siding to the house.

Commissioner Blatt moved the Commission to find as a fact that the proposed application for a certificate of appropriateness, as identified in file number H08-43-COA, if constructed according to the information reviewed at this hearing and any representations made by the applicant on the record of this hearing, is not incongruous with the character of the Hyman Heights Historic District for the following reasons: 3.7.5 If replacement of a deteriorated window or door feature or detail is necessary, replace only the deteriorated feature in kind rather than the entire unit. Match the original in design, dimension, and

material. Consider compatible substitute materials only if using the original material is not technically feasible and 3.7.6 If replacement of a deteriorated window or door unit is necessary, replace the unit in kind, matching the design and the dimension of the original sash or panels, pane configuration, architectural trim, detailing, and materials on the condition that no cedar shakes be used and the windows be 12 over 1. Commissioner McCoy seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

V **David and Sandra Brown** (H08-51-COA) The Chair opened the public hearing. At the request of Ms. Anderson, Commission Coordinator, Commission File No. H08-51-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. Ms. Anderson gave the following background on this application:

The Planning Department is in receipt of an application for a certificate of appropriateness from David and Sandra Brown to undertake the following work at 1242 Hyman Avenue;

1. Installation of vinyl replacement windows.
2. Installation of storm door

Since the proposed project will include the replacement of, or change to, an architectural detail where there is a change from the original or existing materials, it is considered “major work.” An application for a certificate of appropriateness for a major work must be reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).

The subject property is listed as a **non-contributing property**, in the *Hyman Heights Local Designation Report*. The property is described as:

1242 Hyman Avenue Built ca. 1950 and in good condition. Brick, minimal traditional cottage.

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

A. Farrington Barber House. ca. early 1950s. One-story Minimal Traditional style house with an H-shape floor plan. Wing on the south side. Cross gable roof and a front gable roof over the entry stoop. Brick veneer walls. Central brick chimney with chimney pots. Front door is three-lights within a single solid wood panel. Windows are six-over-six, picture window in front, octagonal windows in front gable ends. Large lot with mature trees, nicely landscaped, lot drops to rear.

In June of 2008, staff approved a minor work to construct a wood shed at the rear of the property. As stated above, the applicant proposes to install vinyl replacement windows and a storm door. This application came after the applicant became aware that a COA was required for such work so some work has been done.

The existing wood windows are six-over-six and the replacement windows will match the style of the existing windows. Staff has included pictures of all sides of the house to show the existing windows.

The applicant did not meet with the Design Review Advisory Committee.

David Brown, of 1242 Hyman Avenue, apologized for starting work without permission. They had received a COA for the shed in the back. He said he understands the commission wants to preserve the appearance of the neighborhood and supports this. Mr. Brown said they wanted to replace the windows as the old ones would not open, a safety factor, they were single pane, an economic factor and the aluminum storm windows were ugly. He said they moved forward keeping the appearance of the existing windows along with the size. He said they stopped work when told to and have one window and the door left to do. The Chair asked what door is there now. Mr. Brown said a wooden, rotting screen door. The Chair asked about the front door. Mr. Brown said it is a wood door with triple windows. Commissioner Phillips asked who the realtor for the house that failed to tell them of the district regulations. Mr. Brown said Coldwell-Banker.

The Chair asked if anyone else would like to speak. The Chair closed the public hearing.

Commissioner McCoy said there really isn't much to do. Commissioner Tate said she would like to have a full view door.

Commissioner Phillips moved the Commission to find as a fact that the proposed application for a certificate of appropriateness, as identified in file number H08-52-COA, if constructed according to the information reviewed at this hearing and any representations made by the applicant on the record of this hearing, is not incongruous with the character of the Hyman Heights Historic District for the following reasons; 3.7.6 If replacement of a deteriorated window or door feature or detail is necessary, replace only the deteriorated feature in kind rather than the entire unit. Match the original in design, dimension, and material. Consider compatible substitute materials only if using the original material is not technically feasible and 3.7.9 if additional windows or doors are necessary for a new use, install them on a rear or non-character-defining elevation of the building, but only if they do not compromise the architectural integrity of the building. Design such units to be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not to duplicate the original on the condition the applicant use a full view door on the front. Commissioner Blatt seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VI **Ariel Glassman** (H08-52-COA) The Chair opened the public hearing. At the request of Ms. Anderson, Commission Coordinator, Commission File No. H08-52-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. Ms. Anderson gave the following background on this application:

The Planning Department is in receipt of an application for a certificate of appropriateness from Ariel Glassman to undertake the following work at 123 5th Avenue East;

1. Replacement of door and windows on front, lower level
2. Raise height of awning
3. Replace wood on front façade with stucco
4. Replace current red fence with new 9 foot section of iron railing

Since the proposed project will include installation of a sign greater than nine square feet, it is considered “major work.” An application for a certificate of appropriateness for a major work must be reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).

The building is listed as **contributing** in the *Main Street Local Designation Report*. The property is described as:

123 Fifth Avenue East. Commercial Building. ca. 1940. Contributing.

Modern two-story red brick building with casement windows on the second story. Modern storefront.

The building is listed as **non-contributing** on the National Register report of 1988 and **contributing** in the Main Street District Expansion and Updating Report of 2006:

123 5th Ave E. Non-contributing. Modern two story, simple red brick structure. Windows altered. New storefront with bay window in recessed area. (1988 Report)

123 5th Ave. E. Commercial Building. ca. 1949. Contributing.

Additional information for this building relates to the storefront area which has been recently recessed back, and the windows on the second floor, while in the original openings, have been changed to a casement style. According to Sanborn maps, this building was built ca. 1949 (Sanborn Maps). This more definite date is a correction from the original nomination. Sufficient overall integrity of design and materials has been retained for it to be re-evaluated as a contributing resource. (2006 Report)

On August 28, 2008, Katrina Newton, Commission Coordinator, gave approval for the following minor work: removal of wood panel, awning and rail at front of building.

As stated above, the applicant wishes to make changes to the façade of the building. Concerning the primary door, the applicant wishes to move the existing doorway flush with the window to the left keeping the porch area, that will be accessible from the inside of the building. The current stock door would be replaced with a savaged, antique ten-panel solid oak door from the 1930s. The two front windows on the first floor would be replaced. The one to the left of the door would be solid glass with a tilt out transom at the top. The bay-windows to the right would be replaced with a custom slider window for an open air feel. Neither of the two existing windows are original to the building. The applicant would like to trim the windows in wood to match the door. The applicant would also like to paint the trim of the upper two windows the same wood color to give a consistent look.

For the awning, which has been removed, the applicant proposes to replace with the same black canvas material two feet higher to show more of the entrance to the building. The business name, **Vue**, would be on the front and both ends. The awnings on the second floor will remain.

Currently a wood front façade is in place. It is unlikely this is original and there is no masonry behind it. The applicant would like to replace the wood façade with stucco. In Section 3.4.3 of the Design Guidelines, **Masonry**, stucco is listed as a typical masonry material found on the exterior of historic buildings. Concerning the color of the stucco, the applicant is proposing to match the mortar color between the bricks. The applicant would like to replace the prior

fencing on the front porch with a wrought iron section to separate the costumers from the sidewalk.

Ms. Anderson reported the Design Review Advisory Committee, at its meeting on Wednesday, September 3, 2008, discussed the application with the applicant. The Committee thought that the proposed changes to the façade were appropriate. The Committee liked the idea of matching the proposed trim of the lower windows with the existing upper windows. The applicant explained the work to be done will be environmentally responsible and green in every way possible.

Lawrence Delewski and Ariel Glassman, of 123 5th Avenue, addressed the Commission. Mr. Delewski explained the front door would move up to the front of the porch and the porch would stay. He said the wood walls are 2 x 4s with packing tape and some drywall. It will be reframed and stucco applied which is cost efficient. He said the windows would have pine trim. They will have the same awning which will move up now that the wood header is gone.

Commissioner Phillips clarified they are only working on the bottom front of the building Mr. Delewski said yes adding they did meet with John Horton who was not at the DRAC meeting. Commissioner Tate complimented the applicants on a great application and asked if they had selected the iron work. Mr. Delewski said they were waiting on direction from the Commission. The Chair asked the height of the ironwork. Mr. Delewski said around 42 inches high, enough to put a separation between customers and the sidewalk. The Chair asked if there were any Baker-Barber photos of the building. Mr. Delewski said not that they could find. They did go to the library and try to find some. He added John Horton give them a lot of information on buildings such as this one. The Chair asked why they wanted to move the front door. Mr. Delewski said it will make a better foyer area as there are several levels once you go inside. He added this will also help with ABC and ADA concerns. The Chair asked about the French doors. Mr. Delewski said they would lead from the inside area to the porch. Commissioner Tyler asked about the brick pavers. Mr. Delewski said they are existing. The Chair clarified the awning would be raised. Mr. Delewski said yes.

Commissioner Blatt said they should strongly consider the swing of the door whether out or in and be sure there is the required separation between living quarters and commercial space. Mr. Delewski said the firewall separation has been checked. The Chair said he does not like the idea of the door swinging out and if it has to, they should reconsider moving it up to the sidewalk. Commissioner Tyler asked if wheelchairs will be able to come in. Mr. Delewski said the site has been ADA inspected and meets the requirements of a building this old. Commissioner Tyler asked when they will begin. Mr. Delewski said they are ready to start.

The Chair asked if anyone would like to speak for or against this project. Lee Henderson-Hill of DHI said she would like to encourage approval as this has been a vacant building with a façade that needed attention and will be a great addition to Main Street.

The Chair closed the hearing.

Commissioner Tate moved the Commission to find as a fact that the proposed application for a certificate of appropriateness, as identified in file number H08-53-COA, if constructed

according to the information reviewed at this hearing and any representations made by the applicant on the record of this hearing, is not incongruous with the character of the Main Street Historic District for the following reasons: 2.1.1 Retain and preserve signage that is original or is important in defining the overall historic character of a building, 2.1.13 Mount awnings in a manner that does not obscure or damage historic architectural features of the building. Awnings should be placed appropriately above the transom and projecting over individual window or door openings. They should fit within the window or door opening; 2.1.15 Select awning colors that are appropriate to the design of the building and 3.1.7 Where original or early storefronts no longer exist or are too deteriorated to save, retain the commercial character of the building through contemporary design which is compatible with the scale, design, materials, color and texture of the historic buildings. Commissioner Henry seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VII Committee Reports –

- Designation Committee – No report
- Community Affairs – Ms. Welter reported a newsletter would be coming out in November and the Holiday Tour of Historic Inns and Cooker Caper would be on December 14 from 1:00 – 5:00.
- District Improvements – The Chair asked about the post for the district signs. Ms. Welter said no decision has been made.

VIII Commissioners Comments. The Chair referred to the brochure for the Preservation NC annual conference in Winston-Salem. After discussion the Commission decided to pay for two people to attend the conference. *Commissioner Tate moved the Commission pay the transportation costs. Commissioner Blatt seconded the motion which passed unanimously. Commissioner Tate moved the Commission pay the motel costs. Commissioner Tyler seconded the motion which passed unanimously. Commissioner Tate moved the Commission use the City of Hendersonville’s per diem rates for the costs. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion which passed unanimously.*

IX Staff Comments. Ms. Welter asked if the Commission would like to continue to support Preservation North Carolina with a \$100 donation. *The Commission agreed by consensus.*

Ms. Anderson asked that members whose terms are up in November to write a letter expressing their desire for reappointment.

X Financial Report. *The Commission approved the financial report by consensus.*

XI Adjournment. *The meeting adjourned at 6:16 p.m.*