

Historic Preservation Commission
October 15, 2018 Meeting Minutes

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Chairman Pamela Sue Anderson, Vice-Chair Sharon Whitaker, and Commissioner Patti Jordan. Alternate Commissioner Richard Parson was in the audience.

Absent: Commissioner Blane Conklin and Commissioner Paul Emerson.

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

Also Present: Certificate of Appropriateness applicants Lisa and Joseph Adams, Robert Levin, and Rodney Palmer of Cornerstone Architects.

C. Citizen Communication

There were no Citizen Communications.

D. Approval of Minutes

D.1 Consider approval of the minutes of the September 18, 2018 Regular and September 25, 3018 Special Called Historic Preservation Commission meetings.

Motion: by Commissioner Jordan and Second by Vice-Chair Whitaker to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2018 and September 25, 2018 HPC meetings as submitted.

Vote: Aye: Chair Anderson, Vice-Chair Whitaker and Commissioner Jordan. Nay: none. The vote was 3-0.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness

E.1 Consider an action regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness application for an addition to the servant’s cottage at 702 E. Main Street.

Planning Tech Kerstin Harding summarized the applicants’ requests regarding the “servant’s cottage” that was recently moved to their property at 702 E. Main Street:

- ♦ The front porch had fallen apart while the cottage was being prepared for relocation. The applicants proposed rebuilding it to the same dimensions, using the same four porch columns. The difference would be that the cottage is now on a pier-and-beam foundation, so the porch will be raised above grade.
- ♦ Replace the red asphalt shingle roof with galvanized standing-seam metal, similar to the roof on the main house.
- ♦ Build an addition along the back (east) side of the cottage, approximately 10 ft by 22 ft.
 - Applicant is deciding between a shed or cross-gabled addition roof.
 - Addition will have a south-facing door with salvaged stained-glass windows to either side. The applicant indicated a metal door on the application but is also considering using a salvaged wooden door.
 - Addition will have a wooden pergola over a south porch. The porch will be to the side of the addition but will not extend in front of the original structure.
 - Siding on the addition will be 6-inch shiplap, similar to the existing structure’s 6-inch tongue-and-groove siding.

Ms. Harding noted that the City’s Design Guidelines state that additions should relate to and complement the historic structure but should also be clearly distinct from and secondary to the original structure. To achieve this staff recommended that the original corner boards and gable eaves remain in place to distinguish the addition from the historic structure. Staff felt that the metal roof was appropriate but recommended conditioning that the decorative metal roof ridge crest remain, and that the door and siding must be wood. She noted that several features had not been addressed in the

application, (including the door and window trim profiles, paint and stain colors and possibly porch railing if required) and recommended allowing staff approval of these items.

Motion: by Vice-Chair Whitaker and Second by Commissioner Jordan to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition as presented with the following conditions:

- The original corner boards and gable eaves must remain in place.
- The decorative metal roof crest must remain in place.
- The door and siding must be wood.
- Additional items related to the addition project (such as window and door trim profiles and paint or stain colors) may be reviewed by staff provided they do not contradict what the HPC has approved.

Vote: Aye: Chair Anderson, Vice-Chair Whitaker and Commissioner Jordan. Nay: none. The vote was 3-0.

E.2 Consider an action regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness application for alterations at 405 E. Main Street.

Principal Planner Jordan explained to the Commission that their meeting packets had not included a staff analysis of the Certificate of Appropriateness application for alterations to the front porch, east porch, and west ballroom doors at 405 E. Main Street because the application had been received shortly before the packets were distributed. The applicants had included the Texas Historical Commission's (THC's) review with their application.

Ms. Jordan gave a brief summary of the property's history and of the Certificates of Appropriateness that had been issued earlier in 2018 relating to converting the property to an event facility. The current request included the following:

New concrete steps would be added to the east and west sides of the front porch. Staff had questions about the railings but agreed with the THC that the steps did not detract from the historic front porch.

The first floor of the east porch (added in the 1960s) by removing the screens and adding new concrete steps on the east side. Staff agreed with the THC that opening the porch per se did not detract from the historic structure but believed that horizontal siding was an inappropriate cladding material for the columns supporting the second-floor enclosed porch, and that the columns should be styled as traditional porch columns with a capital, shaft, and base.

The owners planned to create a large ballroom on the west side of the building by joining two adjacent rooms. The northern of these two rooms was original to the house had had two pairs of wooden doors on the west side. The applicants proposed replacing one set of doors with new doors that would replicate the design of the historic doors but would swing outward and would be fitted with new emergency exit hardware. The other set of historic doors would be unaltered. Both sets of screen doors would be removed.

Staff agreed that the outward-swinging doors were a necessity but questioned why the historic doors couldn't be modified to swing outward and had concerns that the landings of the two sets of doors would be different sizes because the doors swung different directions.

The southern of the two rooms had been added in the 1960s and had aluminum sliding doors that the applicants proposed to replace with new wood windows designed similarly to the historic doors on the north room. Staff agreed that the new windows would better compliment the historic structure than the existing sliding doors did.

The Commissioners asked the applicants for clarification on some of the questions raised by staff. Architect Rodney Palmer explained that on the front porch the handrails at the side would have the same decorative pattern as the other railings in the project, but the handrails between stairs would be simple pipe rails. He mentioned that the THC reviewer preferred white finished railings.

Mr. Palmer said that the intention of leaving the east porch supports with siding was to leave record of the 1960s addition but noted that there were some structural concerns and the supports may need to be made more substantial. Modifications to the historic ballroom doors to swing outward and accommodate emergency panic hardware would be extensive, and they felt it would be better to start with new replica doors to accommodate these features.

Motion: by Commissioner Jordan and Second by Vice-Chair Whitaker to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the front porch stairs, east porch, and west ballroom doors with the following conditions:

- ♦ The screen doors and any removed historic doors are to be stored on site.
- ♦ Staff is to have approval of the final door selection.
- ♦ The east porch supports are acceptable as they are if they have the same siding as on the second floor of the porch.

Chair Anderson asked whether there was any discussion on the motion. Vice-Chair Whitaker added to the motion that any variation on the proposal be brought to staff. Chair Anderson added to the motion that the final selection of porch support materials also be brought to staff.

Vote: Aye: Chair Anderson, Vice-Chair Whitaker and Commissioner Jordan. Nay: none. The vote was 3-0.

F. Presentation/Discussion

F.1 Consider discussion and possible action regarding the 2018-2019 Historic Preservation Commission goals.

Ms. Jordan reviewed the edits that had been made to the draft 2018-2019 HPC goals based on requests at the September 25 work session and comments that the Commissioners had sent to staff. The goals refer to the four broad goals of the HPC’s mission statement (Preservation, Public Education, Heritage Tourism and Community Partnerships), and as requested the specific goals in each category had been grouped into Action Items, Considerations and Regularly Occurring/Ongoing Items. She clarified the distinction between the HPC goals (which are one-year goals specific to the activities of the Commission) and the Preservation Plan (ten-year goals of the overall preservation program) which will be discussed at the next HPC meeting. The Commissioners reviewed the draft 2018-2019 goals and discussed changes, including changing the name of the “Action Item” category to “Priorities.”

Motion: by Vice-Chair Whitaker and Second by Commissioner Jordan to approve the Historic Preservation Commission’s goals for 2018-2019 as amended.

Vote: Aye: Chair Anderson, Vice-Chair Whitaker and Commissioner Jordan. Nay: none. The vote was 3-0.

G. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kerstin Harding
Planning Technician

