

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)**  
City of Belton  
333 Water Street  
Thursday, April 9, 2015

---

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.**

Nelson Hutchinson called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M. Larry Guess arrived at 5:32 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 5 ayes, 0 nays.

**3. H-15-02 Consider authorizing a Façade Improvement Grant to Heartland Resources, 222 East Central Avenue.  
(L and R Meat Market)**

Ms. Newcomer presented the staff report.

Mr. Hutchinson noted that the applicant began work, which the City had to stop and they are now asking for money through the Façade Improvement Grant program. Ms. Newcomer stated that the applicant originally requested an additional \$180.00 to cover the demolition expense, but the applicant cannot receive those funds since the demolition is complete.

Ms. Baggerly asked if the awning would match the previously approved improvements. Ms. Newcomer stated that the proposed improvements (signage and paint) have not been completed to date. She stated that the applicant originally proposed a green awning, but she recommended a neutral color similar to other metal awnings that have been installed downtown.

Mr. Guess asked if the building has been altered. Ms. Newcomer stated that the exterior is stucco and not the original material utilized to construct the building. He inquired about the windows and doors and Ms. Newcomer responded that they are metal. She said that the original limestone is covered on the exterior. Mr. Guess asked if the grey color suited the area or if there is a better choice. Ms. Baggerly stated that she thought the awning would look nice with a red building. Mr. Stumberg noted that the other improvement approved previously was a Texas flag on the north side of the building.

Ms. Baggerly asked if the labor and awning are included in the Façade Improvement Grant (FIG) request. Ms. Newcomer explained that Heartland Resources owns the building and Steve Gray (L&R Meat Market) is a tenant in this building. Mr. Gray submitted a COA request to paint the building and change the signage; however, Ms. Newcomer is unaware when those improvements will begin. The FIG request is from the building owner, not the tenant. Holly Gosh, 6 South First Street, Temple, Texas, spoke on behalf of the applicant. Ms. Gosh stated that they (Heartland Resources) told Mr. Gray they would fix the awning and he could do what he wanted with the exterior, as long as it was approved by the HPC. Ms. Newcomer stated that she will contact Mr. Gray and inquire when the work will be complete and provide an update at the next meeting.

Ms. Baggerly stated that her concern is the appearance of the grey awning with the brown sign that is currently there and the burnt orange door was that previously approved. She stated that she hopes they move quickly with the changes so that it will not become an eye sore. Ms. Gosh stated that it is already an eye sore and Mr. Guess noted that the appearance will improve with the new awning.

Mr. Guess made a motion to approve authorizing a Façade Improvement Grant to Heartland Resources, 222 East Central Avenue. (L&R Meat Market). Ms. Baggerly seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously, with 5 ayes, 0 nays.

**4. H-15-03 Consider a request to construct an upstairs patio and stairway at 219 South East Street, Suite B, located in the Downtown Belton Commercial Historic District, south of Water Street and north of Nolan Creek. (Scores Pizza)**

Ms. Newcomer presented the staff report.

Mr. Stumberg asked if there is a parapet because the rendering showed a flat transition. Leo Camden, 110 East 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Belton, Texas, spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Camden stated that there is not a parapet, the roof is flat and there will be a structural beam that extends from wall to wall that will make it higher. Mr. Stumberg inquired on the current height of the building. Mr. Camden stated it is 13 feet tall. Mr. Stumberg stated that if the height is over 13 feet, a landing will be required. He asked how deep the existing patio is. Mr. Camden stated it is 20 feet X 20 feet.

Mr. Guess asked if a handicap elevator would be required and Mr. Camden stated that it is not.

Mr. Stumberg stated that the issue between renderings versus reality is that the building is 13 feet tall, so twenty-two 11 inch runs are needed for the stairs that will extend less than 2 feet away from the end of the patio. The landing will need to extend into the walkway and the enclosure will need to extend past and around the patio column.

Mr. Camden stated that the observation makes sense but the plan is purely conceptual, at this point. He stated that he wants to get approval first before taking it to a structural engineer.

Mr. Guess asked what the minimum code is and Mr. Stumberg responded that it is seven 11 inch runs.

Mr. Stumberg stated the importance of saving the fascia strip and to ensure that the engineer attaches the stairs to the top or underneath it, so if it does come off there will not be a hole where they cut the fascia strip.

Mr. Camden said that the fascia strip has been repaired several times. They will not attach anything to the front of the building; it will be attached from the top to the roof down to save the fascia strip.

Mr. Guess asked if the current roof is TPO. Mr. Camden stated that the roof is gravel. Mr. Guess asked if the current roof will be kept for the walking surface. Mr. Camden stated that it will not. He stated that pending structural engineer recommendation, it will be wall to wall free span trusts with a wood deck or some type of track that will have a gap between the existing roof surface and the bottom.

Ms. Donahue asked what the corrugated metal on the rear western side of the building will look like from the bridge on Main Street. Mr. Camden stated that as you drive down the bridge, you can see the corrugated metal from the surrounding businesses with pitched roofs. He stated that this building has a flat roof and the corrugated metal will all tie in together. Mr. Camden also stated that the metal is not going all the way to the back of the building; instead it will set back 20 feet from the rear of the

building. He noted that if you drive by now, you can see everything on top of the flat roof, including a satellite, which is an eyesore.

Mr. Guess noted that HPC asked Mr. Dominguez to add a red strip between the metal panels to an addition on Coronas de Oro. Mr. Camden stated that they have no issues doing what HPC recommends. Mr. Guess stated that if they can duplicate what Mr. Dominguez did, it will look as if the improvement was planned. Mr. Camden stated that he believes that it is a stucco strip on Coronas de Oro. He said that the exterior of Scores Pizza is not stucco, so he asked if he could break metal and use the same color to match the one below. Mr. Guess agreed.

Mr. Stumberg noted that there have been two other applications from Ambreco, with only one being completed. He stated that one was left as an eyesore and is afraid that Ambreco will not do what has been recommended by the HPC. Ms. Newcomer stated that this request is not from the leaser, not the building owner (Ambreco). Mr. Stumberg asked if they were considering a wood or steel structure. Mr. Camden said that it is steel with wood cladding.

Mr. Hutchinson stated his concern was structural damage due to high winds because it is an open area that is largely facing west and unsupported. Mr. Camden stated that the structural engineer will investigate those types of issues. He said that the back wall will shade the area in the afternoon when the sun sets and tie everything together to give the walls strength and support. Mr. Stumberg said that the strip of metal would have plumbing and electrical coming through it. Mr. Camden stated that the rear wall will be structural.

Mr. Guess stated that this request is an improvement. Mr. Camden noted that it will be nice overlooking the creek. Ms. Baggerly asked if the creek is visible. Mr. Camden stated that it is visible when standing on the roof.

Mr. Guess inquired if the stairs were going to be metal since they have metal rails. Mr. Camden is proposing to construct a steel stairway with concrete steps.

Ms. Donahue made a motion to approve the request to construct an upstairs patio and stairway at 219 South East Street, Suite B, located in the Downtown Belton Commercial Historic District, south of Water Street and north of Nolan Creek. (Scores Pizza)

Ms. Baggerly seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously with 5 ayes, 0 nays. Mr. Guess asked Ms. Newcomer if the changes they suggested will be reflected when reviewing the plans and Ms. Newcomer agreed.

**5. Consider an interpretation of Section 29.12, Certificates of Appropriateness, in accordance with Section 44, Classification of New and Unlisted Uses, of the Zoning Ordinance, in order to allow administrative consideration of storage buildings in the rear yard.**

Ms. Newcomer stated that she would like to administratively approve sheds, with the exception of carriage houses and sheds that are deemed historic.

Mr. Guess stated that she is asking for them to trust her and he has no reservations in doing so. He trusts that she will bring the cases forward that the HPC will need to review.

Mr. Stumberg stated that they may want to consider the size of the shed. Ms. Newcomer stated that the Design Standards require storage sheds over 200 square feet to have the minimum design standards as the main structure. She stated that she has found that a majority of storage sheds are 200 square feet. She asked if HPC would prefer looking at storage sheds over 400 square feet. Mr. Stumberg stated that if the regulation remains at 200 square feet or less, it will prompt people to

install smaller sheds and they won't need HPC approval, so he recommends any shed over 200 square feet requires HPC approval.

Ms. Baggerly asked if guidelines would be established so that somebody could not purchase multiple small sheds. Mr. Hutchison asked if applicants come in before a pad is down. He brought up the scenario where a person puts down a pad, finds out that they would need to put a smaller shed, and would then be faced with a concrete pad that is larger than the shed. Ms. Newcomer stated that if an applicant begins work without approval, she would bring the case before the Commission. Ms. Newcomer proposed bringing forward COA requests when the total square footage of all sheds on the same property are over 200 square feet. She stated that if she ever feels uncomfortable approving an item administratively, she will present the request to the HPC. Mr. Guess noted that is the reason that he trusts her. Ms. Baggerly stated that in the event Ms. Newcomer would no longer be making these decisions, she would be more comfortable with guidelines in place. Mr. Hutchinson stated that it could be written to where these administrative interpretations end with her resignation. Mr. Guess stated that if she were to leave, this would be off the table. Ms. Newcomer stated that it cannot be written in that matter and suggested that the Commission talk to the City Manager if they ever feel uncomfortable with an administrative decision. Mr. Hutchinson suggested that the interpretations be reviewed every two years.

Ms. Baggerly asked what the standard height is of a shed. Mr. Stumberg said that it could be 8 to 10 feet. Ms. Newcomer stated that it depends on the pitch of the roof. Ms. Baggerly stated that it is preferred that a shed not be much taller than a privacy fence. Mr. Stumberg stated that small metal buildings could be as high as 10 feet and anything above that would be beyond a storage building.

Ms. Baggerly asked if materials need to be discussed. Ms. Newcomer stated that she will approve the materials and will make sure that it matches the house if the shed is visible, following the same guidelines set forth in the City's Design Standards. Ms. Baggerly inquired about the prefabricated storage buildings and if guidelines should be set for those. Mr. Stumberg said that those sheds can be moved. Ms. Newcomer stated that storage sheds were discussed extensively with City Council when the Design Standards were updated in 2014. She was asked to look at pricing of metal storage building versus hardy plank sheds. Ms. Newcomer stated that metal storage buildings are considerably less expensive. A guideline is in place that states if a storage building is visible and more than 200 square feet, it will need to match the materials on the main structure. Ms. Baggerly stated that she is concerned with the appearance of some metal buildings. Ms. Newcomer stated that she is encouraging wooden carports in the historic districts.

Ms. Baggerly made a motion to approve an interpretation of Section 29.12, Certificates of Appropriateness, in accordance with Section 44, Classification of New and Unlisted Uses, of the Zoning Ordinance, in order to allow administrative consideration of storage buildings in the rear yard with the following exceptions: all interpretations reviewed every 2 years and storage sheds up to 200 square feet and not taller than 10 feet. Mr. Stumberg seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously, with 5 ayes, 0 nays.

#### **6. Hold a workshop to discuss the following:**

- Update the Historic Preservation Commission regarding Administrative approvals granted by the Historic Preservation Officer.
- Discuss 200' property owner notifications for Certificate of Appropriateness requests that require HPC approval.
- Discuss alternative HPC meeting schedule and time.

There were some general comments from the Commission with the following conclusions:

- Mr. Guess made a motion to approve 200' property owner notifications. Ms. Baggerly seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously, with 5 ayes, 0 nays.
- The HPC Meetings will continue to meet the second Thursday of every month with a new scheduled time of 5:00 P.M.

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

---

Chair, Historic Preservation Commission