

## Historic Preservation Commission

### October 18, 2016 Meeting Minutes

#### A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m.

#### B. Roll Call

**Present:** Chair Pamela Sue Anderson, Vice-Chair Rae Lynn Tipping, Commissioner Paul Emerson, and Commissioner Sharon Whitaker

**Absent:** None

**Staff present:** Principal Planner Joelle Jordan and Planning Technician Kerstin Harding

#### C. Approval of Minutes

##### C.1 Consider approval of the minutes of the September 27, 2016 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

**Motion:** by Commissioner Emerson and Second by Commissioner Whitaker to approve the minutes of the September 27, 2016 meeting as submitted.

**Vote:** Aye: Chair Anderson, Vice-Chair Tipping, Commissioner Emerson, and Commissioner Whitaker. Nay: none. The vote was 4-0.

#### D. Presentations

##### D.1 Consider a presentation and action concerning a Certificate of Appropriateness for an addition, roof deck and other alterations at 118 E. Main Street.

Principal Planner Joelle Jordan briefly summarized the history of the Farmer's Bank Building at 118 E. Main Street and the applicant's request for alterations to accommodate a new restaurant/bar, including replacing the non-historic rear addition with a new addition, adding a roof deck over the historic structure, and certain restorations to the original building. She stated that staff recommended approval with conditions, which were listed in the Commissioners' packet memo, and asked that the Commissioners include a recommendation to defer any changes or unresolved items to staff.

Kevin Stewart, the project's principal architect, took the podium to describe the project and answer the Commissioners' questions. He explained that the concept of the addition is to complement the historic building in scale rather than material. The roof deck will be supported by steel columns that penetrate through the roof, in order to avoid altering the original brick walls. The operators want the roof deck to be oriented toward the street rather than the back of the building in order to encourage a connection to the street and activate the corner.

Ms. Jordan presented staff analysis and recommendations for the project. Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the rear addition and outbuilding, which are not part of the original building and are not old enough to have acquired their own historical significance. Staff recommends approval of a rear addition of the approximate dimensions submitted, but with significant design changes: creating some architectural features on the blank stucco wall, improving the alley façade, reducing the visual impact of the enclosed rear stairwell, and a different color than the proposed dark gray.

Staff recommended approval of the covered rooftop deck with conditions. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards discourage vertical additions because they change the perceived proportions of the building, and the city's Historic Design Guidelines require that vertical additions should not be visible to someone standing across the street. However, staff felt that an open structure could be permitted, since the plant trellis and open walls did not change the apparent proportions of the historic building. The back of the deck cover would slope toward the back, but the front part of the cover (visible from the opposite street) would be an open trellis with climbing plants. Ms. Jordan showed diagrams of how the front trellis could be lowered, reducing its visual impact. Additional conditions recommended by staff were indirect lighting on the deck and keeping the two original chimneys.

Staff recommended approval with conditions of the proposed measures to restore the main building closer to its original appearance: replacing the front entry with one that is closer to the original, restoring the back door and window arrangement to a part of the east side that had been removed for a taller window, and adding custom window bars that replicate the original ones.

Commissioner Tipping asked what kind of treatment was planned for the existing historic windows, several of which may need repair. Mr. Stewart said that some of the windows do have rot in places, and the intent is to restore them, using as much of the original material as possible. The two new double-hung windows would be fabricated to match the others. Commissioner Tipping asked if there were any extra brick on site that matched the original brick and could be used to replace part of the wall that had been removed. Mr. Stewart replied that he didn't know but certainly would look.

Chairman Anderson noted that they propose to restore the entrance with something similar to the original transom, door and sidelights, and asked whether they also intended to return the entry to the front wall plane, which had been recessed in the 1980s. Mr. Stewart replied that the reason that the entrance had been recessed was probably because code at the time required commercial doors to swing outward, and if they were not recessed they would swing out over the sidewalk. The original doors had swung inward.

Chairman Anderson noted that the metal columns supporting the deck cover and trellis appeared quite large, and asked Mr. Stewart if there was any thing that could be done to lighten its appearance. He replied that for the drawings they used a rule of thumb to size the steel columns/beams, and that they hadn't yet consulted an engineer to determine the correct size.

Chairman Anderson and Commissioner Tipping agreed that the back addition was too dark and featureless, and did not compliment the historic structure. Commissioner Tipping inquired about a more midrange warmer color.

Commissioner Emerson asked Mr. Stewart whether any of the staff recommendations were of concern, and he replied that they didn't.

Commissioner Tipping inquired whether the proposed rehabilitation was speculative or for a specific tenant, and Mr. Stewart replied that the alterations were for a specific tenant's needs.

Chairman Anderson and Commissioner Whitaker inquired about the fabric choice for the side awning, noting that the other awnings downtown are solid, not striped.

Commissioner Anderson inquired about the lighting plan for the deck, and Mr. Stewart replied that they hadn't gotten that far in their design yet.

**Motion:** by Vice-Chair Tipping and Second by Commissioner Whitaker to

The Commission approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the property at 118 E. Main Street with the following conditions:

- Demolition of existing rear addition and outbuilding approved.
- A new rear addition approved as proposed with the following conditions:
  - Stucco exterior finish with color selections to be reviewed by staff.
  - New wood windows to coordinate with existing historic wood windows.
  - Back door facing alley may be steel, as it is not a public door. Final selection to be reviewed by staff.
  - Setbacks and visibility are appropriate as presented.
  - Any future design changes, as well as architectural details that will be defined later, to be reviewed by staff.
- A new rooftop deck over the existing structure approved with the following conditions:
  - Over the deck, the exposed steel columns are appropriate, with final design and color selections to be approved by staff.
  - Final selection of materials and design for trellis and planter to be approved by staff.
  - The setback and visibility are appropriate as presented.
  - Lighting must be indirect, and with lamps not visible from or directed at public areas.
  - The two existing chimneys should remain intact.
  - Furniture and other items on the deck that are not visible from public view are not being considered as part of this review.
- The windows and entry areas were approved with the following conditions:
  - The existing wood windows should remain in place and be repaired wherever possible. If any windows are damaged beyond repair, they should be replaced with new wood windows to match existing.

- The new doors on the front and side will be wood, including associated windows and sidelights, with a design to be approved by staff. Cut sheets should be submitted for staff review prior to ordering.
- Demolition of the side taller window and stuccoed area around it is approved. Any wall areas that need to be filled in shall match the existing fabric of the building as much as possible, with staff review of any brick selections.
- The fabric awning on the east wall is approved as presented with the following conditions:
  - The drop-front design of the awning is appropriate as proposed.
  - The fabric color should coordinate with the overall color scheme of the building and new addition, and should be approved by staff once that color scheme is decided.
- The banding and trim on the existing building are to remain a light color similar to the original limestone.
- The project should include a license agreement for any elements in the right of way and a separate license agreement for street furniture.
- Staff is given review authority over design changes and enhancements. Staff should review an overall lighting plan, and the downspout selection, hardware, the window bars, the historic corner sign, and cut sheets for windows and doors prior to ordering.

**Vote:** Aye: Chair Anderson, Vice-Chair Tipping, Commissioner Emerson, and Commissioner Whitaker. Nay: none. The vote was 4-0.

**D.2 Consider a presentation and action concerning a Certificate of Appropriateness concerning paint and signage at 119 E. Main Street.**

Principal Planner Joelle Jordan gave a brief summary of the two parts of the request. The applicant's sign company had been issued a sign permit for letters placed atop the front canopy, and while the letters installed were the same font as was approved, they had a distressed finish that was not depicted in the application. The question for the HPC was whether having a sign that deviated from the permit would constitute a code violation that would make the property fail to meet the maintenance criteria for the partial tax exemption for historic properties.

The second issue was that the applicants had painted a sign directly on the previously unpainted wall of a neighboring building beside their rear patio. Their intent was to reference signs that had historically been painted on the front of the building (a previously painted stucco surface). According to City Code an HPC-issued CofA must be obtained in order to allow painting an unpainted surface, and signs must not damage a historic surface. Also, the sign had been painted on a neighboring building without the owner's permission. Staff is not sure how to remove the paint from the wall, but would like to establish a timeframe to solicit an expert's recommendation, and is concerned that allowing it to remain would set an undesirable precedent.

Commissioner Tipping noted that the wall had acquired "a patina of repairs" and asked the neighbor's opinion of the sign. Michelle Ly, representing the applicant, said that they had attempted to contact him but had no response yet. Commissioner Emerson asked whether it couldn't simply be painted over and Ms. Jordan explained that would create a large gray patch on the otherwise unpainted wall, and if it proved removable it would probably be allowed to remain, although she was concerned about the precedent that would set. Commissioner Emerson asked whether that concern overrode damaging the wall in removal.

**Motion:** by Commissioner Emerson and Second by Vice-Chair Tipping to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 119 E. Main Street with following conditions:

- Canopy sign lettering acceptable as presented. This information will be conveyed to sign review staff regarding this permit. The Commission asked that future alterations to the sign reflect what is included in the permit application.
- Regarding the sign painted on the wall, the Commission has requested that an assessment be completed on the best method for removal of the sign and a report submitted to staff within 60 days of the date of this letter.

**Vote:** Aye: Chair Anderson, Vice-Chair Tipping, Commissioner Emerson, and Commissioner Whitaker. Nay: none. The vote was 4-0.

**D.3 Consider a presentation and action concerning the Historic Preservation Commission's 2016-2017 goals.**

Ms. Jordan drew the Commissioners' attention to the redline document reflecting discussion about the HPC's 2016- 2017 goals at the September 27 work session. Commissioner Emerson asked what "create a want list of photos" meant, and Ms. Jordan replied that it meant a list of sites that we have little information about, and consider how to find more old photographs of them. Chairman Anderson called their attention to the item changing the Local Legend Selection Committee to an annual appointment, which would require earlier appointment to the Committee.

**Motion:** by Commissioner Whitaker and Second by Commissioner Emerson to approve the 2016-2017 HPC goals as presented.

**Vote:** Aye: Chair Anderson, Vice-Chair Tipping, Commissioner Emerson, and Commissioner Whitaker. Nay: none. The vote was 4-0.

**E. Planner Report**

**E.1 Consider an update on the Round Rock Development Code public outreach.**

Ms. Jordan announced that the Planning and Development Services Department was holding an open house to present a draft of the new Development Code. She reminded the Commission of some revisions to the historic preservation section of the code that had been brought to the HPC for review and comment a few years ago, and explained that they had been incorporated into the current draft code. The draft Development Code is posted online, and she invited the Commission to attend the open house on October 26<sup>th</sup> from 6:00-9:00 p.m. at the Baca Center.

**F. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Kerstin Harding  
Planning Technician