

Minutes of the meeting of the
Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)
City of Belton
333 Water Street
Thursday, August 14, 2014

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

1. Call To Order.

Larry Guess, Vice-chair, called the meeting to order at 5:34 P.M.

2. Minutes from the previous meetings.

Mr. Stumberg made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Baggerly seconded the motion and they were approved unanimously with 4 ayes, 0 nays.

3. H-14-32 Consider a request to construct a 38'8" X 24' addition along the western side of the existing structure at 520 East 6th Avenue, located in the North Central Belton Historic District, on the northwest corner of East 6th Avenue and North Blair Street.

Ms. Newcomer presented the staff report.

Mr. Guess commented that this is an improvement to the original request that was approved. Ms. Donahue, Ms. Baggerly and Ms. Newcomer agreed with the statement.

Ms. Baggerly made a motion to approve the request to install a 24' x 12' stainless steel freezer addition with a masonry wall along the exposed sides at 520 East 6th Avenue, located in the North Central Belton Historic District, on the northwest corner of East 6th Avenue and North Blair Street. Mr. Stumberg seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously, with 4 ayes, 0 nays.

4. H-14-31 Consider a request to install a 6' tall chain link fence with T-posts at 503 North Wall Street, located in the Central Belton Historic District, on the northeast corner of North Wall Street and East 5th Avenue.

Mr. Hutchinson appeared at 5:51 p.m.

Ms. Newcomer presented the staff report.

Mr. Guess asked if the fence with T-posts was approved at some point. Ms. Newcomer stated that it was never approved. Ms. Newcomer stated that the applicant would not be required to change the existing fence, which is 4' chain link fence with galvanized posts. However, the applicant added a new fence extension with T-posts to increase the height another 2'.

The applicant, Shirley Mobley, 503 N. Wall, stated that the property had a galvanized fence and she had thought that she was able to use the same material. She stated that the existing fence is still there because it was cemented and difficult to pull down, so they opened up the fence and used the T-posts for support. Ms. Mobley stated that it was well supported with the posts that it had, but they were unable to find posts of that nature that could be added; therefore, she stated that it overlaps. Ms. Mobley stated that it keeps the dogs in, which prevents the Police from bringing the dogs back home. She stated that they previously had to chain the dog and the dog knocked her husband down to the ground several times. She tried all winter and summer long to resolve it. In spring, she was able to get somebody to come and resolve the problem. She stated that it is the same width as the existing chain link fence. She stated that when she went to City Hall, she was told that the only option was a wooden fence; however, she stated that they failed to mention that it would take twelve people to help, such as family and friends, not a single senior citizen. Ms. Mobley also stated that there were vines on the fence before the winter froze them. She proposed to grow them again, which would be concurrent with historical presence. She stated that historically they didn't have wood fences, but used vines and bushes instead. She stated that if the Committee is recommending a wooden fence, it should be a split well fence because it was the type that was used in the past. She stated that the chain link fence is just as historical as the wooden fences they have today.

Mr. Guess thanked Ms. Mobley for her comments and requested to ask Ms. Newcomer some questions. Ms. Newcomer stated that the applicant did not obtain a fence permit. Ms. Mobley stated that she didn't know it was needed because it was the same type of fence.

Mr. Stumberg noted that the problem the City has is not the fencing material, but the support materials and changing from galvanized posts to T-posts. Ms. Mobley stated that it was not mentioned to her at the time. Ms. Newcomer stated that she did explain different options. Ms. Mobley stated that they offered to paint the posts the same color as galvanized posts.

Mr. Guess clarified with Ms. Newcomer that there was no permit for the fence extension. He also asked if the date was known when the fence extension was installed and if the previous Ordinance was in affect at that time. Ms. Newcomer stated that in February it was noticed, so a letter was sent out immediately. Mr. Guess asked if it was February of this year and Ms. Newcomer responded that it was. She stated that the fence would have been considered grandfathered if it was there prior to Ordinance adoption.

Ms. Baggerly asked if there were any options for an extension to the fence. She mentioned taking the top off the existing chain link fence, adding a coupler and then adding the additional galvanized post, so that it could be extended without changing the base and digging up the concrete posts.

Ms. Mobley stated she didn't find anyone that had given her that solution. She stated that her husband said that there is a school that has prison bars with barbed wire. Ms. Baggerly stated that it would not fit with the historical standards either. She recommended that Ms. Mobley obtain estimates for the coupler, so that she can reuse the top, the posts, and the same chain link fencing.

Ms. Stumberg stated that another option would be to take out the top rail and use a galvanized pipe sleeve that would extend to the concrete and screw in. He stated that standard pipes are 2 1/2" in diameter and that a 3" or 3 1/4" galvanized pipe sleeve could be used. Mr. Guess stated that he believes the posts that Mr. Stumberg is referring to are cheaper than T-posts. Mr. Stumberg stated that they probably are cheaper. He stated that the posts would be a different size, but should meet within requirements. Ms. Newcomer stated that she would imagine the posts would still be compatible. Mr. Stumberg stated that it wouldn't change the look other than raising the height. Ms. Baggerly asked if the homeowner would still be able to recycle the top and Mr. Stumberg stated that they would. Ms. Mobley stated that the galvanized posts are soldered and asked how the sleeves would be put on. Mr. Stumberg stated that if it is soldered, they would need a saw to go beneath the caps to cut them and disconnect them. He stated that a larger post may be needed anyway. Mr. Stumberg stated that it depended on the construction, but another option would be to fuse the metal and cut a few inches to allow for the sleeve. He stated that if it were truly soldered, it could be melted with a torch and then popped off. Mr. Guess stated that he believed that is not welded on.

Mr. Guess inquired on the implications for the fence not being compliant. Ms. Newcomer stated that it can set precedence for future fences in the area. She noted that the existing 4' fence is not historic, but is compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Guess asked if the City had the power to remove the additional fence because it was not permitted. Mr. Guess stated that the best alternative would be to make that fence comply. Otherwise, the fence could be taken down and the applicant would not be able to install the fence requested. Mr. Guess asked if that was a correct statement and Ms. Newcomer responded that it was. Mr. Guess noted that the fence could be forced to take down because it is not compliant and not permitted.

Referring to the outside posts, Ms. Mobley asked if she could attach 6 foot long posts on the outside. Mr. Guess stated that she would not have to do that. He stated that it seemed like she needed help in finding somebody to do the fence properly and the Committee agreed. He stated that the applicant doesn't seem to be unwilling to make it comply and asked if the original request was to put up the additional fence. Ms. Newcomer stated that once staff noticed the fence alterations, letters were sent out and that is when the applicant came to speak with her. She stated that the applicant told her that her dogs were getting out, so she didn't want to take it down. Ms. Newcomer then provided her some alternatives for taller fencing.

Mr. Stumberg made a motion to disapprove the request to leave the fence as is, a 6' tall chain link fence with T-posts at 503 North Wall Street, located in the Central Belton Historic District, on the northeast corner of North Wall Street and East 5th Avenue.

Ms. Baggerly seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously with 4 ayes, 0 nays. Ms. Baggerly told the applicant that she hopes that a solution can be found for her. Mr. Guess stated that they can and will.

Mr. Guess excused himself at 5:55 p.m.

5. Hold a work session to review and discuss the framework of the Historic District Design Guidelines.

Ms. Newcomer gave a presentation to the Commission covering the following:

- Chapter 1: Historic Preservation
 - Preservation Planning Tools
 - Belton Historic Districts
 - National Register of Historic Place
 - Architectural Style and Character
 - Façade Improvement Grant

- Certificate of Appropriateness Process
- The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

- Chapter 2: Residential Components- Do's and Don'ts
 - Doors
 - Windows
 - Porches
 - Roofs and Gutters
 - Exterior Materials
 - Synthetic Siding
 - Alterations and Additions
 - Carports/Garage
 - New Construction

- Chapter 3: Evolution of Building Types

- Chapter 4: General Principles of Design Guidelines in the Downtown Belton Central Historic District
 - Storefronts
 - New Designs for Storefronts
 - Alterations
 - Security Devices
 - Street Furniture
 - New Construction for Contemporary Buildings Reconstruction

- Chapter 5: Building Component Do's and Don'ts in the Downtown Belton Central Historic District
 - Entryways
 - Doors
 - Windows
 - Cornices, Parapets
 - Architectural Details

- Remaining Chapters
 - Entryways
 - Doors
 - Windows
 - Cornices, Parapets
 - Architectural Details

There were some general comments from the Commission.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Chair, Historic Preservation Commission