

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)**  
City of Belton  
333 Water Street  
Thursday, September 12, 2013

---

The Historic Preservation Commission met at 5:30 P.M. in the Wright Room at the Harris Community Center. The following members were present: Larry Guess, Randy Stumberg, Sheila Donahue, and Nelson Hutchinson, Chair. The following Staff Members were present: Erin Newcomer, Planning Director and Laura Arevalovalle, Planning Clerk.

**1. Call To Order.**

The meeting was called to order at 5:34 P.M.

**2. Minutes from the previous meetings.**

Mr. Hutchinson made a motion to approve the minutes as written. They were approved unanimously, 4-0.

**3. H-13-21 Consider authorizing a modification of the Façade Improvement Grant that has been awarded to Larry Gaines, 104 East Central Street.**

Ms. Newcomer presented the staff report.

Mr. Guess made a motion to pass the modification of the Façade Improvement Grant that has been awarded to Larry Gaines, 104 East Central Street. Mr. Stumberg seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously, 4-0.

**4. H-13-20 Consider a request to install a storage building at 203 North East Street, located in the Downtown Belton Commercial Historic District, west of North Penelope Street and north of East 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue.**

Ms. Newcomer presented the staff report.

Mr. Stumberg asked if the building was considered new construction and if it falls under the masonry ordinance (Design Guidelines), even though it is relocating a building. Ms. Newcomer explained that is considered an accessory building, and stated that she does not believe that it fits in because it is a commercial area; however, if this request is approved by the HPC, she requests that it be painted.

Mr. Guess asked who owns the parking lot that the storage building will be occupying. Ms. Newcomer stated that it is owned by Bargain Barn and pointed out the location where the applicant would prefer to have the storage building. Keith Wallace, 204 N. East Street, spoke on behalf of the applicant and stated that the purpose of the building is to store records. Mr. Wallace stated that they are no longer able to store records at the current location and stated that they were able to obtain the building for a reasonable price. He also stated that he plans on purchasing the entire property (owned by Bargain Barn) at a later time. He stated that the organization is federally and state funded; therefore, they must keep records indefinitely. The records are kept in Temple and they need to store them in Belton, so that it is more accessible for them and the auditor. The building is on skids because they may not need the storage building in the future when they obtain the entire property, as they can possibly use Bargain Barn to house the records.

Mr. Hutchinson asked Ms. Newcomer to show him the possible locations and setbacks for the building on the presented photographs. Ms. Newcomer identified the location proposed by the applicant and the location that she would prefer, which is toward the back of the building and less visible.

Mr. Stumberg asked if the building was going to have electricity and the applicant, Mr. Wallace, replied that it was not. Mr. Stumberg inquired if it is considered a building and Ms. Newcomer responded that it is an accessory building, similar to a garage or storage shed. He asked how it would be different than parking a trailer, because it is on skids and movable. Ms. Newcomer stated that they would require a building permit to inspect the building and ensure it is acceptable in regard to City building codes. Mr. Wallace stated that they would paint the building to match the Bargain Barn or the Old Depot.

Ms. Donohue asked what the hurry is to move the records, since they are currently in a safe place and they plan on purchasing the Bargain Barn. Mr. Wallace stated that the records were at a location in Temple and the owner was allowing them to keep the records there for free as a tax write off; however, ownership has changed at this location and the new

owner is going to charge them to keep the records. The price of the building is cheaper than half of a year of storage that the new owner would charge them to store the records. He also stated that the owner of Bargain Barn is not ready to retire, so they have a 3-5 year project plan to acquire the building. Ms. Donohue asked if they could store the records at the Bargain Barn, since they do plan on acquiring it. Mr. Wallace stated that there is no room for the records in either the Bargain Barn or the Depot. The organization is federally and state funded, and there is no funding for storage. He stated that they work with neglected children and run-away youths. He also stated that they are the only shelter in Central Texas.

Mr. Guess stated that he supports what the organization does, but it could set a dangerous precedence by putting a storage building in a parking lot downtown. Mr. Guess made a motion to table the item, case H-13-20, to investigate further possibilities and find another solution. Ms. Donohue seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously, 4-0.

**5. H-13-19 Consider authorizing a Façade Improvement Grant to Silvia Copenhaver, 100 North Main Street.**

Mr. Stumberg abstained from the case.

Ms. Newcomer presented the staff report.

Mr. Guess asked Ms. Newcomer to show the photograph of the tile and asked if there was paint overspray. Ms. Newcomer stated that the brown color was paint overspray. Mr. Guess asked if that was the only section of tile and Ms. Newcomer stated that it was not and showed him on the photographs where it was located on the building.

The applicant, Silvia Copenhaver, 1308 Twin Knoll Drive, Murphy, Texas, stated that they would like the grout to be off white and that the previous owner had painted the grout brown, so the grout is currently not the original color. She mentioned other buildings in Downtown Belton that have a similar color of grout that they are wishing to use. Mr. Guess asked to whom Ms. Newcomer spoke to about the color of grout and she stated Steph McDougal., the historic preservation consultant. Mr. Guess asked if we knew what the original color of the grout was. Randy Stumberg, with Architectural Edge, stated that on the Anderson side of the building, it looked like it contained the original grout color.

Mr. Hutchinson asked if the grout absorbs the paint when it is painted. Mr. Stumberg stated that there are two options: stain or paint the grout. He stated that it is probably a sealed surface because it has already been painted before. Mr. Hutchinson noted how difficult it would be not to get any paint on the tile. Mr. Guess stated that the color should match the building and Mr. Hutchinson then asked how much of the building is the original grout and how much is brown. Mr. Stumberg stated that it is about 55 percent.

Ms. Donohue inquired on the condition of the grout and if re-grouting was an option. Mr. Stumberg stated that the grout was in good condition.

Mr. Guess asked if the off white grout had a sandy surface and if it had been painted or treated. Mr. Stumberg stated that he believes that it hasn't been treated or sealed, but cannot be completely sure. Mr. Guess stated that if it were his building, he would paint all the grout to match the original off white color, including repainting the original grout. The applicant, Steve Copenhaver, 1308 Twin Knoll Drive, Murphy, Texas, stated that one of the issues going forward is that there are a few tiles missing and at that point they would need to resolve the grout color issue and replace the broken tile and paint the grout at the same time. Mr. Guess asked if they are opposed to having all of the grout off-white and he stated that they are not opposed and would like to make the grout all the same color. Mr. Guess agrees that it should all match.

Ms. Donohue inquired about the awning. Ms. Newcomer explained that it will be a horizontal awning and displayed the picture depicting what the awning will look like. Ms. Newcomer noted that in reference to the painting of the grout, it was simply just an opinion of the historic consultant. Mr. Guess stated that he believes it would serve history correctly by painting it off white.

Ms. Donohue asked if the neighboring business is going to replace their awning to match the new one. Ms. Newcomer stated that she has not heard anything from the other business, but they are welcome to apply for a Façade Improvement Grant to match the work being done on this building. Mr. Hutchinson stated that he was not aware that these changes are not for the entire building. Ms. Newcomer explained that these changes are only for half of the building and showed where it would split in the middle. Mr. Hutchinson stated that there is another building painted half white and half brick and is an eye sore. He fears that this one, with it being only painted on one side, at no fault to the applicant, would make for two eye sores on one block. Mr. Guess asked if it was two owners for the property and Ms. Newcomer responded yes. Mr. Guess noted that what happens to the second property is irrelevant to what happens on the corner of the property. Mr. Guess stated that he would rather have half an eye sore than a whole eye sore. Mr. Hutchinson disagreed and stated the building sticks out more. Mr. Guess stated that the owner of the neighboring business may be encouraged to make changes after they see the changes being made at 100 North Main Street. Mr. Stumberg stated that it could be option for the other property owner

to pay the upcharge while the painter is there and it would be less expensive that way. Mr. Stumberg stated that it would be less expensive for the other property owners to have the facade cleaned and painted. Mr. Stumberg asked if the applicant has met the neighbor and Ms. Copenhaver stated that they have only spoken in reference to her purchasing their property and the owner declined. She stated that the awning on the other property has been missing since they have started looking at the property, a year and half ago. Mr. Hutchinson stated that it would be nice if the awning went all the way across the building, but would require participation from the other owner of the neighboring business. He noted that when two businesses share one building, it is difficult to get both owners on the same page at the same time. Mr. Stumberg stated that the awning could be continued at a later date. Ms. Donohue asked if anyone had spoken with the other property owner to investigate if they would be interested in making the same improvements while the painter is at 100 North Main Street. It was concluded that no one contacted the neighboring property owner to the north, but Mr. Copenhaver, the applicant, stated that it is something they can easily do.

Mr. Hutchinson asked what the second floor will be used for and Mr. Copenhaver stated that it will be used commercially, possibly for meetings. Mr. Hutchinson asked if the second floor was sound and safe to walk around. Mr. Stumberg stated that both floors will be fully built out and the upper story windows will be replaced to improve air circulation.

Mr. Guess made a motion to approve a Façade Improvement Grant to Silvia Copenhaver, 100 North Main Street. Ms. Donohue seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously, 3-0.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

---

Chair, Historic Preservation Commission