

CITY OF HENDERSONVILLE
Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes of Meeting of June 16, 2010

Commissioners Present: Staci Blatt (Vice Chair), Bette Carter, Cheryl Jones, John Ogletree,

Commissioners Absent: Marty Payton, Brooke Tate (Chair), Jo Tyler

Staff Present: Tim Murphy, City Planner

- I Call to Order.** The Vice Chair called the monthly meeting of the Hendersonville Historic Preservation Commission to order at 5:00 p.m
- II Agenda.** *On motion of Commissioner Carter, seconded by Commissioner Ogletree, the Commission approved the agenda.*
- III Minutes.** *On motion of Commissioner Carter, seconded by Commissioner Jones, the minutes of May 19, 2010 were approved.*
- IV. 538 N. Main Street, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, File # H10-23-COA.** Mr. Murphy reminded the Commission that on May 19, 2010, an application for a certificate of appropriateness from Charles and Carrie Kuester was reviewed by the Commission at a quasi-judicial hearing. The application proposed to replace metal clad wooden windows with vinyl windows. City Attorney Sam Fritschner has prepared Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law regarding the Commission's decision.

Commissioner Jones moved the Commission to adopt the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for file number H10-23-COA. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ogletree and passed unanimously.

- V 202-206 N. Main Street, Certificate of Appropriateness, File # H10-34-COA.** Prior to opening the public hearing, the Vice Chair announced that any persons desiring to testify in any of these hearings must first be sworn as a witness 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 these applications should disclose it now.

After swearing in potential witnesses for this hearing, the Vice Chair opened the public hearing. At the request of Tim Murphy, City Planner, Commission File No. H10-34-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.

The Planning Department is in receipt of an application for a certificate of appropriateness permit from Robert and Layla Rogers for modifications to 202-206 N. Main St. This application has been forwarded to the Historic Preservation Commission for review as a “major work” due to the extensive renovations and material changes proposed. Included with this memorandum are photographs of the property as well as existing and proposed site plans and project narrative provided by the applicant.

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

202-206 N. Main Street. Commercial Building. ca. 1920. Plain, one-story painted brick Commercial Style building with recessed brick panels above a modern storefront, and a stepped parapet above. Transoms remain above north end of storefront. In 1943, this building was in use for ice cream manufacturing.

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

202-206 N. Main Street. Late 1920s. Plain one-story painted brick commercial structure with recessed panels above modern storefront. Transoms with structural glass remain above modern aluminum awning.

Mr. Murphy reported that this building currently contains a doll store at 206 N. Main St. and a vacant storefront at 202 N. Main St. that was most recently occupied by a T-shirt store. The applicants propose to renovate both storefronts. A restaurant is proposed at 202 N. Main St. that will utilize sidewalk and rooftop dining. The proposed alterations are shown on the site plans and are described as follows:

Storefront

1. Remove existing full length storefront windows and replace with wooden windows having 8 panes each with wood raised panels below the windows.
2. Install 2 double wooden doors and 1 single wooden door with each door having a window with 8 panes and a wood raised panel below the window.
3. Remove the existing awning at 202 N. Main St. and install 2 new fabric awnings.
4. Remove existing signs and install a new sign above the proposed awnings.
5. Install new light fixtures above the proposed sign.
6. Remove paint from storefront.

Side Façade adjacent to 2nd Ave. E.

1. Remove plywood from window openings and install new aluminum clad wooden windows
2. Enclose 1 window opening
3. Install 3 new awnings over single windows
4. Install a new sign
5. Install a new light fixture over the sign
6. Repoint brick as necessary

Rear Façade adjacent to Edwards St.

1. Remove existing doors and wood covering door openings

2. Remove existing air conditioning unit and guard posts
3. Install new fixed carriage overhead doors
4. Remove upper level double hung windows and replace with new aluminum clad wooden windows
5. Remove existing awning and install 2 new awnings
6. Install new fire escape
7. Install new door on fire escape landing
8. Repair deteriorated bricks and repoint as necessary
9. Repaint

Side Façade (left elevation)

1. Remove plywood from 1 window
2. Remove windows and replace with aluminum clad wooden windows
3. Repair deteriorated bricks and repoint as necessary
4. Repaint

Roof

1. Remove existing parapet wall on roof between 202 N. Main St. and 206 N. Main St.
2. Install seating area for restaurant
3. Install stainless steel cable railing around seating area
4. Install greenscape between seating area and edge of roof
5. Install stucco clad stairwell enclosure
6. Install high efficiency mechanical space containing solar panels
7. Install wooden buffer fence around mechanical space
8. Install planters between mechanical space and edge of roof
9. Rebuild original chimney with existing brick and top with new copper vent cap
10. Install new copper vent cap over existing chimney
11. Seal top of existing concrete coping with clear masonry sealer

Rear parking

1. Pave and stripe existing gravel parking area on opposite side of Edwards St.
2. Install privacy fence around dumpster
3. Remove existing overgrown trees and grasses
4. Install landscaping between parking area and existing retaining wall

Mr. Murphy reported that the applicants met with the Design Review Advisory Committee at 202-206 N. Main St. on June 2, 2010. The Design Review Advisory Committee provided the following recommendations to the applicant:

1. Installing wood paneling on the front of the building would be appropriate since darker wood finishes were typical for 1920s buildings.
2. Remove the muntins from the proposed storefront windows. Larger panes of glass without muntins would have been typical of the 1920s.
3. Although early photographs of the storefront were not available, DRAC advised that the storefront windows would most likely have had a horizontal transom bar at door height with separate transom windows above the bar. DRAC suggested removing portions of the

storefront to search for evidence of a transom bar and that the applicant should attempt to replicate the original storefront appearance.

4. DRAC suggested that the plywood be removed from the windows along 2nd Ave. W. in order to evaluate the material and condition of the windows. If possible, the existing windows should be restored instead of being replaced with new aluminum clad wood windows. If the windows cannot be restored, the muntin pattern of the existing windows should at least be replicated.
5. DRAC noted the deterioration of the bricks on the rear of the building and said that it was most likely the result of the mortar being stronger than the brick. DRAC suggested replacing the deteriorated bricks as necessary with new bricks matching the appearance of the existing bricks as closely as possible.
6. DRAC was in favor of the proposed rooftop improvements considering that the majority of alterations will not be visible from street level.
7. DRAC noted that the installation of the fire escape and conversion of one of the upper rear windows into a door were necessary improvements in order to make rooftop dining feasible.
8. The applicant proposes to remove the paint from the building using a material that will peel the paint off. DRAC said that this is appropriate provided that the material is first tested on an inconspicuous portion of the building.
9. DRAC suggested that the proposed storefront signage be installed to fit within the recessed panels on the upper facade.

The Vice Chair asked if anyone had questions for staff. Commissioner Carter asked if there was 1 continuous recessed panel above the storefront or if there were 2 separate panels. Mr. Murphy clarified that there are 2 panels. Commissioner Carter disagreed with the DRAC recommendation that the sign be placed within 1 of the recessed panels because it would look awkward if the sign was not centered on the storefront. Commissioner Carter also disagreed with the DRAC recommendation that the muntins be removed from the storefront windows. She said that there are no old photographs of this storefront that show whether muntins were present or not.

The Vice Chair asked if the applicant would like to speak. Robert Rogers of 4037 Little River Road addressed the Commission. Mr. Rogers provided a sample of an aluminum clad wooden window that he would like to install on the sides and rear of the building. He clarified that the windows on the storefront will be wooden and will not be clad with aluminum. Mr. Rogers provided a sample of the wood paneling to be installed below the windows on the storefront. He also provided a sketch of what the storefront would look like if the muntins were not installed, however he stressed that it is his preference to install windows with muntins. Commissioner Carter said that the muntins would help buffer sunlight entering the restaurant.

The Vice Chair asked if an elevator was necessary to provide access to the rooftop. Mr. Rogers said it is his understanding that an elevator is not required because the same menu will be served on the ground floor as on the roof.

Commissioner Carter asked about the condition of the windows covered by plywood along 2nd Ave. E. Mr. Rogers said that he has not removed the plywood and cannot verify the presence or condition of these windows. He added that the original windows on the rear and northern side of the building have already been replaced. Mr. Rogers said that his desire is to replace all of the windows on the rear and sides with new aluminum clad wooden windows.

Commissioner Jones asked how the sign will be affixed to the storefront. Mr. Rogers said that the sign will not be recessed but will be bolted to the storefront. He added that the sign will cover up the gap between the recessed panels creating the illusion that the recessed panels are continuous.

Commissioner Jones asked about the methods to be used to repoint and repair the brick. Mr. Rogers replied that it is his understanding that a weaker brick was used on the rear and northern side facades and that the mortar used on these facades is stronger than the brick which has resulted in brick deterioration. Mr. Rogers said that it is his preference to remove the paint on the rear and northern side of the building but that he does not anticipate doing so because of possible damage to the brick. He also mentioned that there are stair step cracks in the mortar that will require rods to be installed to maintain stability. Mr. Rogers said that he will use mechanical grinding to remove the mortar and that blasting or high pressure washes will not be used. He anticipates repointing and repairing the brick only where it is deteriorated.

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

Commissioner Carter asked how the Commissioners felt about the muntins and not installing the sign in the recessed panels. Commissioner Jones felt that the muntins and non-recessed sign were appropriate.

Commissioner Jones moved the Commission to find as a fact that the proposed application for a certificate of appropriateness, as identified in file number H10-34-COA, if constructed according to the plans reviewed at this meeting and any representations made by the applicant on the record of this hearing, is not incongruous with the character of the Main Street Local Historic District for the following reasons:

SIGN GUIDELINES

2.1.3 Use traditional materials commonly found on turn-of-the century commercial buildings such as wood, metal, or stone or use modern materials that have the appearance of traditional; 2.1.4 Signs should be placed in locations that do not obscure any historic architectural features of the building or obstruct any views or vistas of Hendersonville's historic downtown; 2.1.6 Signs illuminated from within are generally not appropriate. Lighting for externally illuminated signs should be simple and unobtrusive and should not obscure the content of the sign or the building façade; 2.1.7 Signs must meet the requirements of Article XIII of the City of Hendersonville's Zoning Ordinance.

AWNING GUIDELINES

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; 2.1.9 Base the design of new awnings on historic documentation of the building or examples from buildings of similar style and age. Awnings for new buildings should be of similar materials, size, and scale of that commonly found in the historic district; 2.1.10 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. A continuous awning is not appropriate; 2.1.13 Must meet all encroachment regulations relating to public safety as outlined in Section 46-82 of Hendersonville City Code.

PARKING GUIDELINES

2.2.1 Whenever possible, retain and preserve the historic configuration and materials of paved areas such as alleys and sidewalks; 2.2.2 Parking in downtown should be located to the rear of the building. In certain cases, it may be appropriate for parking to be located to the side and rear of the structure. Parking lots should not be located on a corner lot; 2.2.5 Gravel and unpaved parking areas or pedestrian walkways are not appropriate.

LIGHTING

2.4.1 Introduce exterior lighting that is compatible with the historic nature of the structure, the property, and district. Compatibility of exterior lighting and lighting fixtures is assessed in terms of design, material, use, size, scale, color, and brightness; 2.4.2 Whether lighting the street or parking areas, appropriate fixtures should be selected that are compatible with existing fixtures and the historic character of the district; 2.4.3 When mounting lighting fixtures on buildings, select those that are as unobtrusive as possible and whose installation will not damage or conceal any historic architectural features; 2.4.4 Rather than indiscriminately lighting areas, introduce subtle lighting qualities by carefully locating light sources; 2.4.5 Introduce lighting levels that provide adequate safety, yet do not detract from or overly emphasize the structure or the property; 2.4.6 Introduce directional lighting that does not spill light onto adjacent properties. Exterior lighting in parking lots should be directed into the parking area itself.

STOREFRONT GUIDELINES

3.1.4 If replacement of a deteriorated storefront or storefront feature is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, material, texture and detail; 3.1.5 When reconstructing a historic storefront, base the design on historical research and evidence. Maintain the original proportions, dimensions and architectural elements; 3.1.6 Whenever changes are required to meet building or accessibility codes, they should be done in a way that is the least intrusive to the façade and without destroying historic materials and features.

SIDE AND REAR FACADES GUIDELINES

3.3.4 If replacement of a deteriorated façade feature is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, material, texture and detail; 3.3.5 When reconstructing a historic façade or feature, base the design on historical research and evidence. Maintain the original proportions, dimensions and architectural elements; 3.3.6 If there is historic evidence of a public entrance on a rear façade, rehabilitate the façade to provide for an attractive access from rear parking areas; 3.3.7 Downtown buildings with rear access should use small signs or awnings to provide for visual identification; 3.3.8 Storefronts on side or rear facades must comply with the Storefront Guidelines under Section 3.1.; 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.

WINDOWS AND DOORS

3.4.2.2 Retain and preserve openings and details of windows and doors, such as trim, sash, glass, lintels, sills, thresholds, shutters, and hardware; 3.4.2.3 If replacement of a window or door element is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, pane or panel division, material, and detail; 3.4.2.8 The use of reflective or highly tinted glass is discouraged; 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; 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.

MASONRY

3.4.3.1 Retain and preserve original masonry walls, foundations, and roofs; 3.4.3.2 Retain and preserve all masonry construction features that are character-defining elements of historic buildings, including walls, foundations, roofing materials, corbels, chimneys, piers, arches, quoins, cornices, and lintels; 3.4.3.3 Retain and preserve historic masonry materials whenever possible. If replacement is necessary, use new masonry materials and mortar that match the historic materials in composition, size, shape, color, pattern, and texture. Consider substitute materials only if the original materials are not technically feasible; 3.4.3.4 It is not appropriate to apply paint or other coatings to unpainted masonry elements that were historically not coated; 3.4.3.5 Paint previously painted masonry elements in colors that best reflect the color of the masonry material; 3.4.3.7 Removal of paint from masonry surfaces is encouraged when the brick is of high quality and was intended to be exposed. Undertake removal only with a chemical paint remover specifically formulated for masonry. Always test the remover on an inconspicuous area or a test panel first. 3.4.3.8 When removing paint from a masonry surface, use the gentlest means possible. High-pressure water cleaning (greater than 500 PSI) or other harsh methods can destroy the surface of historic brick and damage the mortar between bricks. 3.4.3.9 Protect and maintain historic masonry in appropriate ways: Monitor masonry for cracks and signs of moisture damage, Ensure that water does not collect at the base of a masonry foundation or chimney, Clean masonry only if necessary to remove heavy soiling or prevent deterioration, Eliminate any vegetation that may cause structural damage or hinder ventilation and surface drainage of a masonry element, Use the gentlest means possible to clean historic masonry. Cleaning with a low-pressure (500 pounds per square inch or less) water wash, using detergents and natural bristle brushes, is preferred over harsher methods, Test any proposed cleaning method on an inconspicuous sample area first; 3.4.3.10 If cracks in mortar joints, crumbling mortar, loose bricks, damp walls, or damaged plaster indicate deterioration, repoint mortar joints of masonry surfaces in appropriate ways: Carefully remove deteriorated mortar by hand-raking the joints. Using electric saws or hammers can damage the masonry, Duplicate the strength, the composition, the texture, and the color of the original mortar. Replacing a softer mortar with one high in portland-cement content can cause serious damage to existing masonry, Duplicate the width and the joint profile of the original mortar joints. 3.4.3.11 It is not appropriate to use high-pressure cleaning methods such as sandblasting and waterblasting

on historic masonry surfaces. Such cleaning techniques permanently damage the masonry surface and accelerate deterioration by removing the outer edge and exposing the softer inner core of the brick.

SAFETY AND ACCESSIBILITY GUIDELINES

3.6.1 Review proposed new uses for existing historic buildings to determine if related building code and accessibility requirements are feasible without compromising the historic character of the building and the site; 3.6.2 Meet health and safety code and accessibility requirements in ways that do not diminish the historic character, features, materials, and details of the building; 3.6.3 Where possible, locate fire exits, stairs, landings, and decks on rear or inconspicuous side elevations where they will not be visible from the street; 3.6.4 It is not appropriate to introduce new fire doors if they would diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features. Keep new fire doors as compatible as possible with existing doors in proportion, location, size, and detail; 3.6.5 When introducing reversible features to assist people with disabilities, take care that the original design of the porch or the entrance is not diminished and historic materials or features are not damaged.

UTILITIES AND ENERGY RETROFIT GUIDELINES

3.7.1 Retain and preserve the inherent energy-conservation features of a historic building, such as operable windows, transoms, awnings, and shutters; 3.7.2 Improve thermal efficiency by installing weatherstripping, storm windows, caulk, and if they are historically appropriate, awnings and shutters; 3.7.3 It is not appropriate to replace transparent glass in windows and doors with tinted or mirrored glass; 3.7.5 Generally, it is not appropriate to replace operable windows or transoms with fixed glass; 3.7.7 If awnings are historically appropriate, install them in door or window openings so that architectural features are not concealed or historic materials damaged. Select colors appropriate to the color of the building; 3.7.9 Locate roof ventilators, hardware, antennas, and solar collectors inconspicuously on roofs where they will not be visible from the street whenever possible. 3.7.10 Install mechanical equipment, including heating and air conditioning units, ventilator hood, etc., in areas and spaces requiring the least amount of alteration to the appearance and the materials of the building such as roofs. Screen the equipment from view whenever possible; 3.7.11 Locate exposed exterior pipes, wires, meters, and fuel tanks on rear elevations or along an inconspicuous side of the building. Screen them from view whenever possible; 3.7.13 It is not appropriate to install large antennas and satellite dishes in the historic district. Small, digital satellite dishes should not be visible from a public street and should be screened from view whenever possible.

REAR DECKS, BALCONIES, TERRACES, & ROOFTOP DECKS GUIDELINES

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; 4.3.6 When adding a rear deck to a historic structure, it should be designed so that it could be removed in the future without any loss to the historic fabric of the existing building.

Upon recommendation by Mr. Murphy, Commissioner Jones added a condition extending the approval period from 6 months to 1 year. Commissioner Jones also added a condition that

the applicant revisit the Commission if any issues arise with the brick on the rear or side facades that necessitate altering the plans.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Carter and passed unanimously.

- VI Vinyl Materials Committee memo and Design Guidelines Discussion.** Mr. Murphy reported that at the Commission's May 19, 2010 meeting the Commissioners directed staff to revise the Vinyl Materials Committee memo to include additional references to the Main Street Design Guidelines. The Commission requested these revisions in order to clarify that the Vinyl Materials Committee memo is applicable to projects in the Main Street Local Historic District as well as the residential Local Historic Districts. Since the May 19th meeting, City Attorney Sam Fritschner has advised staff that the Historic Preservation Commission's decisions should be based on the adopted Design Guidelines in order to better withstand a legal challenge. The City Attorney has recommended to staff that the Commission incorporate information from the Vinyl Materials Committee memo into the residential and Main Street Design Guidelines as opposed to having a separate document.

Mr. Murphy suggested that the Commissioners could continue this discussion at their next meeting since several members of the Commission are absent.

The Commission decided by consensus to continue this discussion at the next meeting.

VII Committee Reports.

Designation Committee – Will meet following this meeting.

Community Affairs – No report.

District Improvements – No report.

VIII Commissioners Comments. No comments.

- IX Staff Comments.** Mr. Murphy reminded the Commissioners that there are 2 empty seats on the Commission and encouraged them to have any interested persons contact the City Clerk.

- X Financial Report.** *Commissioner Ogletree moved to accept the Financial Report which was seconded by Commissioner Jones and passed unanimously.*

- XI Adjournment.** *The meeting adjourned at 5:58 p.m.*