

Minutes of the meeting of the
Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)
City of Belton
333 Water Street
Thursday, April 11, 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, Nelson Hutchinson, Dan Kirkley and Sheila Donahue arrived at 5:45 P.M. The following Staff Members were present: Erin Newcomer, Planning Director and Laura Arevalovalle, Planning Clerk.

Pledge of Allegiance- Randy Stumberg led all present.

Invocation- Dan Kirkley gave the Invocation.

1. Call To Order.

The meeting was called to order at 5:33 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-13-07 Consider a request to construct a carport at First United Methodist Church, 405 North East Street, located in the Central Belton Historic District, south of East 5th Avenue and north of East 3rd Avenue.

Ms. Newcomer presented the staff report.

Mr. Guess asked if there was a picture of the actual carport. Ms. Newcomer said that there was not a picture of the actual carport, but they do have a flyer of a similar carport, except the sides of the carport would extend down to 12" from the ground. Mr. Guess asked if the carport would be rounded. The representative from First United Methodist Church, Kelly Yancey, 3020 Sommit Drive, explained that it would look like the example from the flyer, except the sides would be extended down at the sides and painted beige to match the garage and the Pastor's house adjacent to the location of the carport. Ms. Newcomer stated that there are currently no design guidelines for the Historic Districts.

Mr. Kirkley commented that this is a good location for the proposed carport because it will cover the exterior stair case of the building behind it and shield the view of the shed. Mr. Yancey explained that they cannot park there now because the trees drip on the buses, even though it is the most convenient place to park them.

Mr. Guess asked if any other design was considered. Mr. Yancey replied that he was not aware of any other design being considered and chose this carport for economic purposes.

Mr. Hutchinson asked how the carport will be anchored. Mr. Yancey stated the manufacturer produces a screw anchor and it will be placed in four or five different locations. If this is not the appropriate screw type, they would go with a double angle mobile home anchor. Mr. Kirkley stated that a majority of the carports he has seen utilize an anchor system.

Mr. Guess stated that he was concerned with the rounded edges of the carport not fitting in with the structures around it due to the sharp angles it encompasses. He also stated that the carport appears to be more temporary than the others. Mr. Yancey responded that the color will match surrounding house and shed. When someone drives by, they will only see the side of the carport.

Mr. Kirkley made a motion to approve the request to construct a carport at First United Methodist Church, 405 North East Street. Mr. Stumberg seconded the motion and it passed with 3 ayes and 1 nay.

4. H-13-09 Consider a request to construct a storage building; remove electrical boxes and install one box for 200 amp service; construct a fence; repair the windows; and demolish and reconstruct an addition at 311 East 10th Avenue, located in the North Central Belton Historic District, on the southwest corner of East 10th Avenue and North Wall Street.

Ms. Newcomer presented the staff report. Ms. Donohue was present for this case and the remaining cases.

Mr. Kirkley asked for clarification on the location of the fence. Ms. Newcomer stated that they are proposing to build the fence around the parameter of the lot and also the front yard. They would also like to also install a double gate in the front

yard. The fence would continue along the front of the property beyond the double gate. Mr. Kirkley asked if it was common to have a privacy fence across the front of the house. Ms. Newcomer stated that there are some 3 foot tall fences in along the front yard property line within the historic districts that are allowed by code; however, the applicant has indicated they would like the 6 foot tall privacy fence installed for safety since the house is close to the road. If the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the 6 foot tall privacy fence within the 25' front yard setback, a variance will still be required to install the fence. Ms. Newcomer also stated in the GIS system, the house appears to be at the property line and if that is the case, a fence would not be possible since this area is City right-of-way.

Mr. Guess asked if they were using 12 inch hardy plank on the exterior of the addition and Ms. Newcomer responded that they are requesting to utilize that material. Mr. Guess asked why it could not be 6 or 8 inch wood siding to match the existing house. Ms. Newcomer explained it is preferred for them to not match the existing portion of the home when it is an addition. She also stated that the house currently has vinyl siding and the original exterior may not be constructed with 6 or 8 inch wood siding. The property owners, Eddie and Cody Mabry, 310 E. 10th Avenue, stated that the exterior behind the vinyl siding is 4 inch wood siding. Ms. Newcomer stated that if the property owner where to remove the vinyl and restore the original wood siding, the home will become a contributing structure.

The property owners stated that were planning on removing the vinyl siding from the entire house and installing 12 inch hardy plank. Ms. Newcomer asked them if that was their request today and Mr. Mabry stated that it was. Ms. Newcomer stated that in the original request, they informed her that they would keep the existing vinyl siding on the home. Ms. Newcomer said that if they would like to use 12 inch hardy plank on the house, she would not recommend that request. She stated that she would recommend for the vinyl to be removed and to restore the original wood siding exterior. Mr. Mabry stated he thought it would look better if they matched. Ms. Newcomer explained that with a historic home, the addition should look different than the original house so the original historic structure can be differentiated from the addition. Mr. Mabry concluded that it doesn't matter to him on the size of the hardy plank to utilize on the house. Ms. Newcomer stated that if the Historic Preservation decides to consider this additional request at this meeting, her recommendation is to remove the vinyl siding and restore the original wood siding. Mr. Guess suggested that the Historic Preservation Commission not consider this additional request and only rule on the original request at this time. If the property owner would like to change the exterior of the existing house; it can be presented to the Historic Preservation Commission at a future meeting. Mr. Kirkley noted that if the property owner opted to remove the siding, it could be approved administratively. Ms. Newcomer stated that to be true, unless they wanted to change it to 12 inch hardy plank. If that were the case, this case would need to be presented to the Historic Preservation Commission for approval.

Mr. Guess asked if the storage shed was located on their lot. The property owner stated that it was the neighbors' shed. Mr. Stumberg stated that if they chose to remove the siding, there is always a possibility that the wood underneath the siding may be damaged, which could cause more issues. This would require the property owner to determine which route they would like to take. Mr. Guess asked the property owners if they were able to see what condition the wood is on the existing home and if it was in good condition. Mr. Mabry stated that the exposed wood is generally in good condition.

Mr. Stumberg asked about the roof details on the proposed addition and Mr. Mabry stated that they plan on raising it as high as they could under the existing roof on the house. Mr. Stumberg asked what kind of roofing would be utilized on the proposed addition. Mr. Mabry stated that it would be roll roofing and would be the same color as the roof of the house.

Mr. Guess asked if there would be gate to get from the first fence to the second fence. Mr. Mabry stated where they originally planned to construct the fence would most likely not be approved since their property appears to be over the property line in the existing survey. Mr. Guess suggested placing the 6 foot tall privacy fence between their property and the neighbors' property on the southern side; then bring the 6 foot tall privacy fence to the house on the western side and to the corner. He suggested constructing a 3 feet tall fence along the front property line. Cody Mabry stated that the 3 foot fence would not keep the dogs in and would not provide the security they were hoping to get with the 6 foot tall privacy fence. Mr. Guess asked Ms. Newcomer if a variance is required for the 6 foot tall privacy fence along the front yard property line. Mr. Stumberg stated that the proposed 6 foot tall fence appears to be in the right-of-way and asked Ms. Newcomer who would need to apply for a variance. Ms. Newcomer replied that a fence cannot be located within the right-of-way. Mr. Stumberg stated that it is a moot point to discuss location of the proposed fence along the front yard further. Mr. Mabry stated he looked at the property and the proposed fence along the front yard appears to be over the property line.

Mr. Guess said that he has an issue with a tall fence along the side street. Cody Mabry asked if the 6 foot tall privacy fence could be placed north of the front two windows (along the east side of the house). Mr. Stumberg stated a variance is still required due to the location within the 25 foot front yard setback.

Mr. Stumberg made a motion to approve to construct a storage building; remove electrical boxes and install one box for 200 amp service; construct a fence on three sides that does not obstruct the house; repair the windows; and demolish and reconstruct an addition that includes 12 inch hardy plank siding and asphalt roll roofing to match the roof on the existing house at 311 East 10th Avenue 311 East 10th Avenue, located in the North Central Belton Historic District, on the southwest corner of East 10th Avenue and North Wall Street. Mr. Guess seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously, 5-0.

5. **H-13-10 Consider a request to move a house onto the empty lot; construct a porch, and paint the proposed porch, exterior siding of the house, and window trim located at 724 North Beal Street, located in the North Central Belton Historic District, south of East 9th Avenue and north of East 7th Avenue.**

Ms. Newcomer presented the staff report.

Mr. Guess made a motion to approve to move a house onto the empty lot; construct a porch, and paint the proposed porch, exterior siding of the house, and window trim located at 724 North Beal Street, located in the North Central Belton Historic District, south of East 9th Avenue and north of East 7th Avenue. Mr. Kirkley and Mr. Stumberg seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously, 5-0.

6. **Receive a status report from the 1874 Church Committee and consider a resolution of support**

Rae Schmuck, 616 North Beal Street, spoke on behalf of the 1874 Church Committee. Ms. Schmuck explained that the group was formed in 2007 and is comprised of concerned citizens who did not want the church to be torn down and replaced with a parking lot. Since the group was established, the building has been reinforced. The 1874 Church Committee received a grant from Bell County Historical Association and had a second temporary roof put on, since the first temporary roof was damaged and not reparable. They 1874 Church Committee has added lighting, a security fence, and maintained the lawn. Ms. Schmuck stated that the 1874 Church Committee requested another grant; however it was not approved. The 1874 Church Committee is currently looking at another foundation for assistance. She stated that the 1874 Church Committee has contacted an architect and are contemplating making the church a center for genealogy and research. The cost for the center could be up to \$300,000. The 1874 Church Committee is raising money by producing calendars. The first calendar was completed in 2010 and raised \$15,000; however, the second calendar did not raise as much money as the first calendar.

Mr. Guess commended Ms. Schmuck and the group for preserving the building.

Mr. Kirkley made a motion to approve the resolution of support for the 1874 Church Committee. Mr. Guess approved the motion and it was approved unanimously, 5-0.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Chair, Historic Preservation Commission