

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
Tuesday, August 11, 2020  
Telephonic Meeting Minutes

**Members Present:**

Alan Mesecher.....Chairman

**Members Present Via Telephonic Conference:**

Suzanne Perry (arrived on call at 5:40 p.m.)..... Vice Chairman  
Robin Craig-Hunt.....Member  
Susan Pennington.....Member

**Members**

**Absent:**

Ben Meadows. . . . . Member

**Staff Present:**

Kelvin Knauf, Director of Planning & Community Development  
Wendy Lloyd, Planning Secretary  
Rita Monson, Grants Planner  
Jana Bernard, Code Enforcement Officer

**City Council Members Present**

Brad Childs

**City Council Members Present Via Telephonic Conference:**

None

Chairman Mesecher called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.  
Chairman Mesecher called an identification of quorum (roll call).

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

None

**REGULAR BUSINESS - APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Chairman Mesecher asked for a motion to approve the June 25, 2020 special call meeting minutes

Member Craig-Hunt motioned  
Chairman Mesecher 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Members Voting Aye:** Chairman Mesecher, Member Craig-Hunt & Member Pennington

**Members Voting No:** None

**Motion Carries**

**NEW BUSINESS**

- a. **Consider an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from Steve Maddox to construct an addition to the main structure located at 1002 W. Cypress Avenue**

Mr. Knauf stated before you is an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from Steve Maddox to construct an addition to the house located at 1002 Cypress Avenue. Mr. Maddox desires to construct a 9 foot by 20 foot back porch with a shingled roof and open sides. Included in the packet is plans for the addition, a ground photo of the property and Mr. Maddox if you would like to add or say anything you are welcome to do that.

**Steve Maddox – 1002 Cypress Ave, Orange, TX:** Mr. Maddox stated I attached 3 different sheets or drawings of 3 different angles. It's a pretty simple porch. It is in the back yard and although it won't be seen from the street it will be appropriate to the neighborhood.

Member Craig-Hunt stated are the posts just 6 by 6 posts and so they are not going to be of a decorative manner. Mr. Maddox stated my house wasn't built in 1910 or 1890. It was built in the 1940's and so what was appropriate for the front at that time was more of square post. It is going to be a real nice post but it's going to be of a square style, or a rectangle and it will have some trim around it to make it decorative around the base and at the top. Member Craig-Hunt stated, and it says it's shingled. I don't see any problem with it.

Chairman Mesecher stated I have looked the site over, and it looks very good to me. Steve has done good work. Member Craig-Hunt stated it looks like it is going to blend in with the house fine. Mr. Maddox stated I don't have round posts on the front so it will be the same.

Chairman Mesecher asked for motion to approve

Member Craig-Hunt motioned

Member Pennington 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Members Voting Aye:** Member Pennington, Member Craig-Hunt, & Chairman Mesecher

**Members Voting No:** None

**Motion Carries**

- b. **Consider an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from Nicky Kelly to demolish the existing structure and construct a new structure at 1101 9<sup>th</sup> Street**

Mr. Knauf stated this house endured flooding during Hurricane Harvey. There are 2 structures on the property and the owner desires to tear down only the house and not tear down the other garage structure. There is no historic landmark on the house. GLO houses have been allowed in the Historic District. The owner would like this house torn down and build what we call a GLO house because it flooded. Mr. Kelly if you would like to add anything you're welcome

to.

**Nick Sobrino:** Mr. Sobrino stated I work with Nicky Kelly at RM Quality Construction. I am the preconstruction and rehabilitation manager. This is a project for the GLO Homeowner Assistance Program. These homes have been built around the City of Orange and I don't believe we've come across one specifically in the Historic District before. It's all hardy siding construction. This home is located within a floodplain so it will be elevated and how we have the home currently set is it's a single story home, shingled exterior with hardy siding. If you need images or plans, I can send that over to you, but it is the standard GLO home that has been built all over Southeast Texas. It just so happens that this one is in a Historic District.

Member Craig-Hunt stated I have a question. The existing structure is it going to service the garage apartment that is going to be left. Is it going to service the GLO house like as a garage? Mr. Sobrino stated yes. It's all owned by Mr. Willie Boone. The property is all his so that garage would essentially remain as part of his property. The GLO omits us from touching any additional structures on the lot if they are not interfering with our project of construction of work. There is a decent amount of space between the existing house and the existing garage. We intend to leave the garage for him because the program would not allow us to build him a new one. So, we want to make sure that it gets left there and it's serviceable so he can keep that, and we would just construct the new home. Member Craig-Hunt stated so when the new structure is built and painted, would the garage be painted to look like it's all part or would it stay as-is. Mr. Sobrino stated it would stay as-is. This GLO is all federal funding so they limit us, the construction company as far as what we are allowed to do and not allowed to do. Since this is an existing structure that we cannot guarantee the structural integrity of, we are not allowed to do anything to it. So, that is something that program kind of limits us on what we can do. If a problem were to arise with the garage afterwards or after we did something to it, we could be held liable for that or the GLO could be held liable. So, we try to make sure that we don't do anything to it. If it is something that you folks would deem necessary, that is something we could present to the GLO. I would need something in writing to able to present to them and then it would be up to them to either approve or deny. With these cases with many of the GLO projects, the GLO is denying a budgetary option and that means the applicant is kicked out. So, we try to be kind of careful with what we send their way because we want to get them a new home.

Chairman Mesecher asked for any other questions or discussion.

Member Craig-Hunt stated I guess the house is just not salvageable whatsoever. Mr. Sobrino stated no. According to the GLO programs guidelines, if a budget to repair a home exceeds a certain amount, the homeowner is then slated to be reconstructed and in some cases like this one as well, the house was flooded and he is confirmed to be in new floodplain maps. We have to rebuild the house to be outside of what that floodplain would be to ensure that it is not going to get flooded again. Unfortunately, the GLO has had some cases where some folks' homes did get rehabbed and did get repaired and immediately get flooded again afterwards.

So, we are very careful about making sure that houses within floodplains are built up to make sure that these homes don't have to go through the same thing all over again. Member Craig-Hunt stated so did the garage not flood then. I guess because the lower is the garage, so it didn't matter. Mr. Sobrino stated well yes since most garages do not include plumbing systems, electrical systems, or any HVAC systems, the GLO sometimes will not consider them and if structurally sound will need to be left. It's only within homes once people have to have all their insulation torn out, all the drywall torn out and if it's a 2-story structure, can be considered compromised because of flood damage. Also, since garages are not considered living spaces, I believe the standards are a little bit different. Member Craig-Hunt stated I guess I am just concerned with what state that is in with it being left but at this point it doesn't really matter.

Chairman Mesecher stated any other discussion. None was made.

Chairman Mesecher asked for motion to approve

Member Pennington motioned

Vice Chair Perry 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Members Voting Aye:** Vice Chair Perry, Member Craig-Hunt, Member Pennington & Chairman Mesecher

**Members Voting No:** None

**Motion Carries**

- c. **Consider an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Church of Christ to replace the existing roofs on the structures located at 1000 Elm Avenue, 501 9<sup>th</sup> Street and 410 10<sup>th</sup> Street**

Mr. Knauf stated the Church of Christ would like to like to replace the roofs on their buildings with a metal roof. The church came before the commission a year or two ago to replace the windows and those were approved and then at that point, they had indicated they had wanted to replace the roof. So, before you is a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the roof. In your agenda packet are diagrams and photos showing you the kind of roof they would like to install on their building. It's very similar to the roof of the Gillespie Building at the First Presbyterian Church and that is in the Historic District as well. Dr. Dileo, if you would like to add anything, you are welcome to do so.

**Kevin Dileo – Orange, TX:** Mr. Dileo stated I represent the 9<sup>th</sup> and Elm Church of Christ. We have had some problems with the roof ever since Harvey. It's a huge roof and a shingled roof. We got some contractors out there to take a look at it and it's such a steep roof they feel like when we have the high winds and rain, it tends to lift those shingles up and we are getting wet spots on the ceiling and so forth. Of course, the last one was Harvey and Imelda wasn't so bad but going forward we plan on doing some renovation in the church and we didn't want to be caught with problems later. The contractor suggested a metal roof. A couple different panels they suggested were that AP panel and that CF panel and CFS panel. We haven't chosen which one we would go with, but it would be limited to those 3 panels. As far as color goes, the

existing composite shingles now are rustic red. There is some brown in it, some black in it and the colors wouldn't be far off from that if we went with a metal roof. It would be more of a rustic red or any of those browns. We don't have a contractor yet. We had a little falling out with a bid price. We are trying to tighten that up, but we have it narrowed down to 2 people and whoever does it will be meeting any kind of windstorm and code requirements. It will be done right.

Member Craig-Hunt stated I went by the office and saw the shingle. So, is that not the shingle. Mr. Dileo stated so that CFS panel is one of the shingles that your building recommended. He was concerned about that AP panel that you would see like on the First Financial building or those people right across the street. Those are flatter roofs and they don't show the oil panning effect or the ripple effect when you put up a metal roof as much as a steeper roof. We are on like a 15/14 pitch. He's afraid that would really show out if we went with something flat. Once again, we just wanted to show that as a possibility to go to if we needed to once, we sat down with our contractor. Member Craig-Hunt stated I have a question. These panels the column A where there were some things X out, are the colors that are left the ones that you might use. Mr. Dileo stated yes so, I can even narrow it down more for you. It will either be in column A, the Burnished Slate or the Rustic Red and in Column B, it will either be the Saddle Leather Brown or the Rustic Brown. It's not going to be any kind of crazy colors. Member Craig-Hunt stated as a note, I would go with the Burnished Slate because that Rustic Red is a lot of red. I'm an interior designer and I would go with that Burnished Slate. Are all those colors ok in the historic? I'm kind of new to the roofing thing. Mr. Knauf stated yes, I think those are acceptable. Mr. Dileo stated the existing roof has all of those colors I mentioned except for the Burnished Slate. I just threw that in there because I thought it would still look pretty nice. Member Craig-Hunt stated yes, I think it would just look a little bit nicer when you go with that darker. I don't have a problem with it.

Chairman Mesecher asked for any other comments. None were made.

Chairman Mesecher asked for motion to approve

Member Pennington motioned

Member Craig-Hunt 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Members Voting Aye:** Vice Chair Perry, Member Craig-Hunt, Member Pennington & Chairman Mesecher

**Members Voting No:** None

**Motion Carries**

- d. **Consider a finding of no historical significance for properties located at 1800 Scholars Avenue, 1724 Gans Avenue, 505 Crepe Myrtle Avenue, 311 Massachusetts Street, 1306 Cherry Avenue, and 1207 Burton Avenue**

Mr. Knauf stated these are properties that we are currently look at. They are substandard properties. They have several problems with them. What we are asking you to do is to find no

historic significance to these properties. If it comes to the point where we tear down these properties, we use federal funds to tear them down with. As part of the federal government requirements, they have to go before an environmental review board. Part of the environmental review is to see if there is any historic significance to any of these properties. Rita Monson is our new grants planner. She took Sandy's place. She will go over each property with you.

Ms. Monson stated what we are looking for is a Section 106 clearance. 1800 Sholars Avenue is a 70 year old structure. It's abandoned and open to predation and vagrancy. A concerned neighbor boarded the windows to keep out the vagrants. 1724 Gans Avenue is a 90 year old structure. It's open to predation and vagrancy. Sexual solicitation has been a prior issue at this property. The day this picture was taken, there was a vagrant in one of the rear storage sheds. 505 Crepe Myrtle is a 74 year old structure. The structure is open to predation and vagrancy. The structure is surrounded by overgrown weeds and vines. 311 Massachusetts is a 75 year old structure. The structure was severely damaged in fire. A tree has fallen through most of the roof. 1306 West Cherry is a 100 year old structure. It's abandoned and open to predation and vagrancy. 1207 Burton, the roof has holes. It is not structurally sound, and the siding is deteriorating. It is a 90 year old structure. It is open to predation and vagrancy and the front porch is being supported by makeshift pieces of wood. Mr. Knauf stated I might add that the 1306 West Cherry is in the Historic District. But, a couple years ago the commission granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to tear down both the main structure which the owner tore down and to tear down this structure also. So, the Certificate of Appropriateness has already been approved for tearing down 1306 Cherry. We are just asking that you find no historic significance to it. Ms. Monson stated we found no beliefs that any of these properties have any significance. There are no historical markers on any of the properties.

Vice Chair Perry stated I vote you tear them all down.

Member Craig-Hunt stated what happens to those properties once these are gone. Mr. Knauf stated what happens is the city files a lien on the property for the demolition and then the lien earns interest every year at 10 percent. The owner can pay off the lien or until the property is sold it is paid when the property is sold. The city does not acquire the property. Member Craig-Hunt stated yes that was what I was concerned about. Once they are gone, what then happens to that lot. Who maintains it? Mr. Knauf stated well we expect the owner to maintain it and if they don't then it gets put on the mowing list and the city ends of mowing it and we file mowing liens on the property.

Chairman Mesecher asked for motion to approve no historic significance on these properties

Vice Chair Perry motioned

Member Pennington 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Members Voting Aye:** Vice Chair Perry, Member Craig-Hunt, Member Pennington & Chairman Mesecher

**Members Voting No:** None

**Motion Carries**

**e. Consider setting a workshop date to discuss historic district regulations**

Member Craig-Hunt stated I would like to suggest if at all possible that we don't do this workshop until we can get together in person. This is all very difficult. Between the phone and the Zooms and I feel like the things we need to talk about are important. I would just recommend that we postpone this until we can physically all be together in a room.

Vice Chair Perry stated I agree.

Chairman Mesecher asked for motion approve not setting date until able to meet in person

Member Craig-Hunt motioned

Vice Chair Perry 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Members Voting Aye:** Chairman Mesecher, Vice Chair Perry, Member Craig-Hunt &

Member Pennington

**Members Voting No:** None

**Motion Carries**

Member Craig-Hunt motioned to adjourn

Vice Chair Perry 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Chairman Mesecher adjourned the meeting at 6:01 p.m.**