

Minutes of the meeting of the
Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)
City of Belton
333 Water Street
Thursday, September 14, 2017

The Historic Preservation Commission met at 5:00 P.M. in the Wright Room at the Harris Community Center. The following members were present: Chair Sheila Donahue, Dorothy Coppin, Tammie Baggerly, Ty Hendrick and Diane Pressley. The following Staff Members were present: Director of Planning/Historic Preservation Officer, Erin Smith, Planning Clerk, Laura Livingston and Planner, Kelly Trietsch.

1. Call To Order.

Ms. Donahue called the meeting to order at 5:02 P.M.

2. Minutes from the previous meetings.

Ms. Baggerly made a motion to approve the minutes from the July 13, 2017 meeting. Ms. Coppin seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously with 3 ayes, 0 nays.

3. Administer the Oath of Office to Historic Preservation Commission appointees.

Mr. Ty Hendrick and Ms. Diane Pressley were sworn in by Ms. Livingston as HPC members.

4. Selection of Chair and Vice Chair for the Historic Preservation Commission.

Ms. Baggerly made a motion to select Ms. Donahue as chair of the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Coppin seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously with 5 ayes, 0 nays.

Ms. Coppin made a motion to select Ms. Baggerly as vice chair of the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Hendrick seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously 5 ayes, 0 nays.

5. H-17-03 Consider a request to construct three 6-plex buildings at 440 North Penelope Street, located in the Central Belton Historic District, on the south side of East 5th Avenue, west of North Penelope Street and east of North East Street.

Ms. Smith presented the staff report (Exhibit A).

Chair Donahue opened the public hearing and with no one requesting to speak, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Baggerly asked if the railings along the stairs and around the doors would be wood or metal? Mr. Larry Guess, the applicant, said they are proposed to be metal. Ms. Baggerly asked if the applicant will install outdoor light fixtures? Mr. Guess said yes, it will be security lighting that shines directly down. Ms. Baggerly asked if the lighting will be encased in the ceiling? Mr. Guess said no, the lights are exterior mounting and the stairwell lights are encased. The exterior lights are at the end of the building and point down. Ms. Baggerly asked if there will be lights near apartment

door entrances? Mr. Guess said all entrance doors will have exterior lighting with timers that make them turn on at night, which is a requirement by the city. Ms. Baggerly asked if he had a picture of what the lighting will look like? Mr. Guess said they will be can lights flush with the ceiling.

Ms. Coppin asked about lighting in the parking lot? Mr. Guess said there is currently no plan to install parking lot lights. They feel that the exterior lights on the building will be adequate and don't feel the need to have large parking lot poles, so none are proposed.

Ms. Pressley asked if there is any fencing around the parking lot area, or is it just open? Mr. Guess said the plan is to keep the parking area open to each one of the adjacent streets.

Chair Donahue asked if there are any other questions. With no one responding, she said if not, she would welcome a motion in regard to H-17-03. Mr. Hendrick made a motion to approve the request as presented. Ms. Donahue asked for a second. The motion did not move forward due to a lack of a second motion.

Ms. Smith asked the Commission if they have any questions for the public or the applicant? Ms. Baggerly said she would like to hear from the public again, but asked Ms. Smith if the Commission members can speak to the public after the public hearing is closed? Ms. Smith said the Commission can ask them public questions at any time. Ms. Baggerly said she would like to hear what Mr. Berry has to say. Mr. Charles Berry, 429 N. Penelope Street, said he and his wife are concerned about this apartment complex and the amount of traffic that an apartment complex generates. They live across the street and he has six grandchildren, and there are numerous kids in the neighborhood. The gym already generates quite a bit of traffic. When people come in and out of there, they zoom past and they constantly say "slow down." What more concern can one ask for than a grandparent and other parents as well watching out for their children. Children are our future of the world, so if we're not going to watch out for them, who is going to watch out for them? Also, if it's for the college – why can't the facility be placed near the college where it needs to be? Why can't they expand further with them and not put it near homes and families that are already established? There's also concerns about water and we've been fighting to repair sidewalks and streets and now we're requesting approval to build an apartment complex? Mr. Berry asked, what's really going on? Belton is his home and he would like to keep his home beautiful. He thinks money and time can be spent developing our city, our sidewalks, our people, our streets to make it beautiful and still be safe. Mr. Berry thanked the Commission.

Ms. Baggerly informed Mr. Berry that the Commission doesn't address traffic issues; City Staff do. Ms. Baggerly asked Ms. Smith if she could address the traffic concerns? Ms. Smith said that the Public Works Department reviewed the development plans for this apartment complex. City staff reviewed street conditions adjacent to this development. Public Works has required some enhancements to 5th Avenue, such as the installation of new curb and gutter. The applicant is required to install sidewalks along North East Street and North Penelope Street. This development includes a proposal to construct three driveway approaches, which circulates the traffic a little better rather than having a single-entry point. The applicant has also revised the site plan to include more on-site parking spaces to reduce the amount of on-street parking that would be needed. Ms. Smith said the applicant is present if you have any other questions. Ms. Pressley asked if Mr. Guess planned to market this development to UMHB students? Mr. Guess said not in particular. These are just six-plexes that will be open to the entire community, but we welcome students. He said he expects there will be some college students, though he doesn't know that for sure. We are not marketing to college students.

Ms. Pressley said her greatest concern is she would like to see the aesthetics of the building look more historical in nature. To her it looks more traditional in style. Ms. Pressley said she would like to see the aesthetics be considered, such as a paint scheme on the exterior of the buildings that is compatible with the neighborhood. She said she doesn't believe the building aesthetics are compatible with the neighborhood, but she also likes the idea of this area serving as a buffer between the residences and commercial properties.

Mr. Berry spoke from the audience, saying it is a historic area and they wanted his shed to match the house because it's an historical area. He asked what are they matching here? He asked about the three driveway entrances. Chair Donahue said the public hearing is closed, that can be done later and best addressed by staff. Ms. Smith said if the Commission would like her to address it now, she can. Ms. Smith showed the maps of the driveway locations to each of the adjacent streets. There will be three driveway entrances: a driveway off Penelope Street which is the farthest from the intersection in the safest location; a driveway off 5th Avenue; and then a driveway off North East Street, again a safe location far removed from the intersection. Mr. Berry said the driveway will be located directly across from his house.

Ms. Baggerly asked where are the dumpsters, how will the dumpsters be screened and how will the screening match the building? Ms. Smith said the dumpsters have been re-located to the southern portion of the property from the last time the Commission looked reviewed this case to accommodate additional parking spaces. Ms. Smith said Mr. Guess will construct dumpster enclosures with brick to match the materials of the main building in conjunction with the Design Standards. The dumpster enclosures will contain brick on three sides and an opaque gate on the fourth side, so they will be completely enclosed.

Chair Donahue asked if there are any other questions. With no one responding, she said if not, she would welcome a motion in regard to H-17-03. Mr. Hendrick made a motion to approve item H-17-03 and Ms. Coppin seconded the motion. Chair Donahue asked if there was any other discussion by the Commission before she called for a vote? With no one responding, Chair Donahue called for a vote. The item was approved with 3 ayes (Hendrick, Donahue and Coppin), 2 nays (Baggerly and Pressley).

- 6. H-17-05 Consider a request to install a fabric awning over the western exterior door on the rear of the building at 128 North Main Street, located in the Downtown Belton Commercial Historic District, on the west side of North Main Street, south of West 1st Avenue and north of West Central Avenue.**

Ms. Smith presented the staff report (Exhibit B).

Chair Donahue opened the public hearing, with no one requesting to speak the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Baggerly asked if the Commission allows this fabric awning in the rear of the building, does that set a precedence? Ms. Smith said initially staff strongly encouraged a metal awning. Ms. Smith said Mr. Rabroker expressed the fabric awning is really something they want and it's also a cost factor. Ms. Trietsch and Ms. Smith contacted the historic preservation consultant, Steph McDougal about the type of awning that would be appropriate. Ms. McDougal said not to worry about setting a precedence, it's completely fine for the applicant to install a canvas awning in the rear of the

building because it's well-manufactured it will look fine. Ms. Smith said another positive aspect to utilizing this type of fabric awning is that it only extends over the sidewalk. It is important to ensure this public alley remains unobstructed for Waste Management, Fire and EMS. The horizontal metal awnings are appropriate on the primary façade hanging over the sidewalk where the public walks. The main reason for horizontal metal awnings on the primary façade is to screen the public from the weather so travel down the sidewalk and window shop without worrying about the weather.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Rabroker if he had any comments. He said that was a very good explanation. Mr. Rabroker said the awning is mainly to keep them dry from the rain. They're an engineering company and frequently carrying plans. They don't rely on foot traffic, so it's mainly to keep employees out of the elements.

Ms. Smith said is also more compatible because it is flat and not shaped like a bubble. Ms. Baggerly said if we say OK to this canvas awning, can someone come back regardless of a bubble style or not with a canvas awning? Ms. Smith said the Commission can discourage the bubble awnings. Ms. Baggerly said we can discourage it, but we can't say no if we let this one. Ms. Smith said not necessarily; this isn't a bubble awning. Ms. Smith said the Commission can evaluate requests on a case-by-case basis. This awning is for the rear of the building, not the primary façade. They are very limited on space due to the public alley in the rear and the existing sidewalk width.

Mr. Hendrick asked how the awning will be connected to the building? Mr. Rabroker said he had Centex Manufacturing came to look at it and it will be professionally installed. They looked at the stucco siding of the building and he said they install these types of awnings all the time. He was very confident they will be able to fasten the awning to the structure without harm.

Ms. Baggerly asked Ms. Smith if the chain link fence at the parking lot in the back will always remain, or will the City take this fence down and encourage people to use the alley side of the building as an entrance? Ms. Smith said that is Bell County's parking lot, so that is their decision. Ms. Smith has had owners call her about it and she's encouraged them to speak with Bell County about opening up the fence or creating a stairway entrance from the parking lot to the public alley.

With no further questions Chair Donahue called for a motion. Ms. Baggerly made a motion to approve item H-17-05. Ms. Pressley seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously with 5 ayes, 0 nays.

7. H-17-04 Receive a proposal to replace five historic property identification signs.

Ms. Smith presented the staff report (Exhibit C).

Ms. Baggerly asked if they would be installed with concrete? Ms. Smith said no, they have the designed the signs so the homeowner can move them. The Commission expressed concerns with the stone signs regarding being able to move the signs to weed-eat. Mr. Hendrick said when you look at the older wooden signs, you can tell where the weed-eater hit the signs. The proposed signs will look a lot better. Ms. Coppin asked if the vinyl lettering can be replaced? Ms. Smith said yes, you can replace the insert. Ms. Baggerly asked if the City would buy more of them? Ms. Smith said it depends on available funding, but that is our hope. Chair Donahue said there are several signs that need desperately to be replaced in our neighborhood. Ms. Coppin said these signs look so much better and nicely match the metal of the new signs in downtown and those near the bridge. Ms. Smith said she appreciates the Commission's feedback.

8. Update the Historic Preservation Commission regarding administrative approvals granted by the Historic Preservation Officer.

Ms. Smith presented the list of administrative approvals (Exhibit D).

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Chair, Historic Preservation Commission