

**Historic Preservation Advisory Board Meeting  
January 18, 2007**

2  
4  
6  
8  
10  
12  
14  
16  
18  
20  
22  
24  
26  
28  
30  
32  
34  
36  
38  
40  
42  
44  
46  
48

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Pittman at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present; Davis, Potts, Hanrahan and Pittman (Russo and Holcomb absent).

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Approval of Minutes for the December 21, 2006 meeting.**

Board Member Hanrahan made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 21, 2006 meeting.

Board member Davis seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the December 21, 2006 meeting.

The motion passes 3 to 0 (Potts Abstained) (Russo and Holcomb Absent)

Chairperson Pittman introduced the next agenda item.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**H2007-001: Hold a public hearing and consider a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (CofA) from Kris Hargrove for the alteration/replacement of an existing porch, shutters on front porch windows, and replacement of existing metal skirting at 501 Munson Street (Monnie Rodgers Subdivision, Lot 1). The tract is zoned (SF-7) Single Family Residential and is located within the Old Rockwall Historic District and identified as a "Medium Contributing Property."**

Chairperson Pittman introduced the item and asked staff to comment.

Mr. Spencer gave the staff report.

Chairperson Pittman asked Ms. Hargrove (the applicant) to address the board.

The applicant, Ms. Hargrove discussed with the board that when she bought the house HUD informed her it was not in the historic district. She was not aware of the historic guidelines when she began work on the house. She replaces the front door with a hard wood, Texas star beveled glass door. She stated that the front porch would be replaced with wood to restore its original appearance. Railings on the porch would match the columns and would be painted trim white. She mentioned that the roof would not be changed. The house has an addition on the back that is hardi board and matches the hardi board that will be on the entirety of the house. The plumbing has been brought up to the current code standards. Ms. Hargrove said that she has replaced the garage door and that the front windows have been replaced. She has replaced the shower and glass block window in the back bathroom. Ms. Hargrove stated that she had ordered a metal back door, that the outside light fixtures would be consistent with the style of the house, as would the landscaping.

Chairperson Pittman asked the board if they had any questions for Mr. Hargrove.

Board member Potts asked the applicant if she knew what type of columns she would be using on the house.

Ms. Hargrove stated that she planed on using post and beam turn posts or flat posts, and would be inclined to do what the HPAB suggested.

The board members and the applicant discussed posts.

Board member Potts suggested a square post 8" in size be used.

The board members and applicant discussed the height of the railings, and agreed on a 28" height.

Board member Potts asked about the proposed shutters.

Chairperson Pittman stated that the shutters must be wooden.

Ms. Hargrove agreed.

Mr. Spencer pointed out Section C – Building Standards.

The board and the applicant discussed the 6'-8' board on board privacy fence Ms Hargrove plans on building.

The applicant's son Casey Brown addressed the board and discussed the fence and hardi board. He explained that the hardi board will cover the metal skirting on the bottom of the house that will match the hardi board on the rest of the house.

Board member Hanrahan stated that the shutter must appear to be able to cover the window when closed.

Ms. Hargrove stated that the sidewalk in front of the house will be concrete and move from the front door to the drive way and would not be over 3 ft. in width.

Board member David asked if any particular colors would have been appropriate for the home.

Chairperson Pittman responded that white would have been most appropriate.

Chairperson Pittman closed the public hearing.

Hanrahan made a motion to approve the C of A with the following conditions;

1. The porch posts be square 8"
2. The porch railings be 28" and turned
3. The siding be hardi board to match with the same reveal and finish, and straight down.
4. The shutters will appear to be able to cover the windows if close.

Potts seconds the motion.

2 The C of A is approved with a vote of 4 to 0 (Russo & Holcomb absent).

4 **Miscellaneous discussion of Historical District issues**

6 Board member Potts discussed with the Board preserving historic trees and making  
8 changes to the tree form. Potts volunteered to head up that project.

10 The board discussed a Historic Preservation Consultant.

12 The board discussed the Methodists church and Mr. Spencer gave an update on the  
project.

14 **ADJOURNMENT**

16 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

18 These minutes were approved on February 15, 2007.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Board Meeting  
February 1, 2007 @ 1:00 p.m.**

2  
4  
6  
8  
10  
12  
14  
16  
18  
20  
22  
24  
26  
28  
30  
32  
34  
36  
38  
40  
42  
44  
46  
48

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Pittman at 1:00 p.m. with the following members present; Holcomb, Davis, Russo, Potts, Hanrahan and Pittman (Holcomb and Ron Harper absent).

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Propose a change to the proposed North Goliad Guidelines and present those changes to the City Council at the February 5<sup>th</sup>, City Council Meeting and take any action necessary.**

Chairperson Pittman asked the Board if there are any comments or changes from the board for the guidelines.

Board member Potts responded saying that he reviewed what Chairperson Pittman and Board member Hanrahan had put together and was approving of it in its current state. He suggested to the board that they address in the changes all the requests from the P&Z and read aloud from the letter from the P&Z.

Chairperson Pittman addressed the issue of demolition and of buildings relocation and the board discussed the issues with relation.

Board member Hanrahan stated that this document should not be modified just for the Planning and Zoning Commission, but for the property owners and potential property owners and City Council. She said that publishing information about relocation is the best way to inform the public.

Board member Davis suggested that the word “encourage” be used to describe building relocation in the guidelines.

Board member Russo agreed

Chairperson Pittman asked the board if they should address a time frame for location.

Board member Potts commented that the HPAB should understand and support The P&Z Commission’s wants while trying to implement historic preservation.

Board member Davis suggested changing the relocation to be “encouraged” to avoid speculation and then take building relocation on a case by case basis.

Board member Russo stated that the board should stay firm with what they believe and go forward with the guidelines.

2 Board member Potts stated that he didn't want waste the time the board had spent working on the guidelines and thought they should be working as a cohesive unit.

4 Chairperson Pittman stated that at the Feb. 5<sup>th</sup>, 2007 meeting the City Council will decide if they want to take the guidelines to public hearing.

6 Board member Hanrahan makes a motion to accept the guidelines with the suggested change from Board member Davis of inserting the word encourage to describe building relocation.

8 Board member Russo seconds the motion.

10 The item is approved by a vote of 5 to 0 ( Holcomb and Harper Absent).

### 12 **ACTION ITEM**

14 **Approve a presentation to be made to the City Council concerning the proposed North Goliad Historic District to be presented to the City Council at the February 5<sup>th</sup> City Council Meeting and take any action necessary.**

16 Chairperson Pittman presented the prepared power point and reviewed the slides.

18 Board member Hanrahan suggested printing the power point to give the City Council members physical copies.

20 The board members discuss the history of the properties.

22 Board member Potts stated that they need to be prepared for questions from a business point of view as well as from a historic point of view.

24 Board member Hanrahan said that there is no dollar value on preserving history.

26 The board discussed denying a C of A for demolition in the Historic District, and discussed the P&Z Commissions stance of Historic Preservation.

28 The board discussed, in favor and against landmark status as an option for protection of properties.

30 The board discussed PD 50 and whether it has encouraged renovation.

32 Chairperson Pittman calls for a motion

34 Board member Hanrahan made a motion to approve the presentation.

36 Board member Russo seconds the motion.

38 The presentation is approved by a vote of 5 to 0 (Holcomb and Harper Absent).

### 40 **Miscellaneous discussion of Historical District issues**

### 42 **ADJOURNMENT**

44 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

46 These minutes were approved on February 15, 2007.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Board Meeting  
February 15, 2007**

2

4

**CALL TO ORDER**

6

The meeting was called to order by Pittman at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present; Davis, Potts, Russo, Harper, Hanrahan and Pittman (Holcomb absent).

8

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Approval of Minutes for the January 18, 2007 meeting.**

Board Member Hanrahan made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected of the January 18, 2007 meeting.

14

Board member Potts seconded the motion to approve the minutes as corrected of the January 18, 2007 meeting.

16

The motion passes 4 to 0 (Harper & Russo Abstained) (Holcomb Absent)

18

**Approval of Minutes for the February 1, 2007 meeting.**

Board Member Hanrahan made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected of the February 1, 2007 meeting.

20

Board Member Davis seconded the motion to approve the minutes as corrected of the February 1, 2007 meeting.

22

The motion passes 5 to 0 (Harper Abstained) (Holcomb Absent).

24

Chairperson Pittman introduced the next agenda item.

26

**Z2007-004: Consider a request by Kenneth Cullins for approval of a zoning change from (SF-7) Single-Family district to (RO) Residential Office district, being a 0.756-acre tract known as Lot C and Lot D-1, Block 122, B.F. Boydston Addition, located at 401 Fannin and 201 Olive, within the "Old Town Rockwall" Historic District and take any action necessary.**

28

30

32

Chairperson Pittman introduced the item and asked staff to comment.

34

Mr. Spencer gave the staff report.

36

The board and Mr. Lacroix discussed what the applicants are planning to do with the property.

38

Chairperson Pittman stated that the GR zoning district had been very successful in that area and that changing the zoning on that property would help it fit in with the rest of the street.

40

42

Board member Potts discussed the Olive (flying bungalow) rezoning case. He stated that he was not sure that he would support the zoning change because if boundaries are not drawn now GR will continue the spread further down Williams St.

44

46

2 Board member Hanrahan said that she worried that GR would continue down that street  
and that she would like to see it stay single family.

4 Mr. Lacroix commented about staffs recommendation and stated that the Austin property  
and the lot behind it would have to be together to rezone for parking and that parking could  
6 also contribute to Downtown parking.

8 Board member Russo stated that RO zoning would be more appropriate in his opinion, but  
that GR zoning could jeopardize that property.

10 Board member Davis asked if the property was deemed a High Contributing property, and  
12 if there was potential that the whole Olive lot would be used for parking.

14 Mr. Lacroix answered yes.

16 Chairperson Pittman said that Williams St. could be a boundary.

18 Mr. Lacroix stated that the house has been zoned for Office uses in the past.

20 Board member Hanrahan makes a motion to maintain the SF zoning and recommend  
denial of the rezoning request.

22 Board member Potts seconded the motion to maintain the SF zoning and recommend  
denial of the rezoning request.

24 The motion passed by a vote of 4 to 2 (Russo and Harper Against) (Holcomb absent)

26 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

28 **H2007-002: Hold a public hearing and consider a request from Kim Hanna of Transglobal**  
30 **Inspections for a Certificate of Appropriateness (CofA) to permit demolition at 804 North**  
32 **Goliad, being Lot 8 of the Barnes Addition. The tract is zoned (PD-50) Planned Development**  
**No. 50 and is located within the Old Town Rockwall Historic District and identified as a**  
**"Non-Contributing Property."**

34 Chairperson Pittman introduced the item and asked staff to comment.

36 Mr. Spencer gave the staff report.

38 The board agreed that the CofA to permit demolition was appropriate for this property, but  
because the applicant was not present Chairperson Pittman opened and continued the  
40 public hearing until the applicant was able to represent them self.

42 Board member Hanrahan made a motion to continue H2007-002 until the 3/15/2007  
meeting.

44 Board member Russo seconded the motion to continue H2007-002 until the 3/15/2007  
meeting.

46 The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 0 (Holcomb absent).

48 **Miscellaneous discussion of Historical District issues**

- 2 Mr. Lacroix discussed that he spoke with Kathryn Seals about a Historic Survey.
- 4 The board discussed a Historic Preservation Officer.
- 6 Board member Potts is continuing his work on the Tree Project.
- 8 Chairperson Pittman discussed Demolition Review with the board.
- 10 Mr. Spencer discussed the updates to the webpage with the board.
- 12 Board member Potts discussed the direction of the NGHDG after the Feb 5<sup>th</sup> Council meeting with the board.

14

**ADJOURNMENT**

16

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

18

These minutes were approved on March 15, 2007.



**Historic Preservation Advisory Board Meeting  
March 15, 2007**

2  
4  
6  
8  
10  
12  
14  
16  
18  
20  
22  
24  
26  
28  
30  
32  
34  
36  
38  
40  
42  
44  
46  
48

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Pittman at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present; Potts, Harper, Hanrahan and Pittman (Holcomb, Russo & Davis absent).

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Approval of Minutes for the February 15, 2007 meeting.**

Board Member Hanrahan made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected of the February 15, 2007 meeting.

Board Member Harper seconded the motion to approve the minutes as corrected of the February 15, 2007 meeting.

The motion passes 4 to 0 (Holcomb, Davis and Russo Absent).

Chairperson Pittman introduced the next agenda item.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**H2007-002: Continue a public hearing and consider a request from Kim Hanna of Transglobal Inspections for a Certificate of Appropriateness (CofA) to permit demolition at 804 North Goliad, being Lot 8 of the Barnes Addition. The tract is zoned (PD-50) Planned Development No. 50 and is located within the Old Town Rockwall Historic District and identified as a "Non-Contributing Property."**

Chairperson Pittman introduced the item and asked the applicant to address the board.

The applicant's representative, Dena Carruth, addressed the board.

Board member Hanrahan asked Mrs. Carruth what the applicants planned on doing with the property after the demolition.

Mrs. Carruth responded that she was not sure other than that they planned on cleaning up the property.

Chairperson Pittman continued the public hearing.

Chairperson Pittman closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

Board member Potts made a motion to approve the CofA .

Board member Hanrahan seconded the motion to approve.

The CofA passed by a vote of 4 to 0 (Holcomb, Russo & Davis absent).

2 **H2007-003: Hold a public hearing and consider a request for a Certificate of**  
3 **Appropriateness (CofA) from Jason & Anna Potts for an accessory structure located in the**  
4 **rear yard of 601 Williams Street St (Lots 1,2,3, 4, Block B, Foree). The tract is zoned (SF-7)**  
5 **Single Family district and identified as a "High Contributing Property".**

6 Chairperson Pittman introduced the item and asked staff to comment.

8 Mr. Spencer gave the staff report and stated a change in the staff report, that the  
9 accessory building could sit 3 ft. from the rear set back like.

10 Board member Hanrahan asked to see a site plan.

12 Staff put up a site plan from a previous submittal from the applicant's of the same property.

14 The board and staff discussed an aerial photo of the property and location of the proposed  
16 accessory building.

18 The applicant, Anna Potts addressed the board.

20 Board member Hanrahan asked what the orientation was of the accessory building.

22 Mrs. Potts stated that the proposed building would be located along the fence line and that  
24 it would not affect the tree in that area. She presented a drawing of the accessory building.

26 Staff added again that the accessory building can be located within 3 ft. from the rear  
28 property line as stated by Rick Sherer, City of Rockwall Building Inspection Supervisor.

30 Chairperson Pittman asked how the proposed building would be in relation to the house  
32 next door.

34 Mrs. Potts answered and stated that the building would not cover any windows.

36 Board member Harper asked if the 16 ft. side of the building would sit along the property  
38 line and what the foundation would be constructed of.

40 Mrs. Potts answer that the longer side would be along the property line and that the  
42 foundation would be constructed of pier and beam.

44 Board member Hanrahan asked if Mrs. Potts had spoken with the neighbors.

46 Mrs. Potts responded that they had.

48 Board member Hanrahan asked if a notice had been sent out to property owners.

Staff responded that a notice had not been sent out because the ordinance does not call  
for such.

Chairperson Pittman calls for any more questions.

Chairperson Pittman closes the public hearing and calls for a motion.

2

Board member Harper makes a motion to approve the CofA with staff recommendations.

4

Board member Hanrahan seconds that motion to approve the CofA with staff recommendations.

6

The CofA is approved by a vote of 3 to 0 (Potts abstained) (Russo, Holcomb & David Absent).

8

**Miscellaneous discussion of Historical District issues**

10

Robert Lacroix was appointed as Historic Preservation Officer.

12

Discussion of the Cade House and Mirror Mirror projects.

14

Board member Potts tree project discussion and presentation of his proposed application.

16

Mr. Cotti addressed the board to discuss the Rockwall Community Playhouse and plans for rehabilitation.

18

Mr. Cotti announced that this will be his last meeting because his term is up.

20

**ADJOURNMENT**

22

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

24

These minutes were approved on May 17, 2007.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Board Meeting  
April 19, 2007**

2  
4  
6  
8  
10  
12  
14  
16  
18  
20  
22  
24  
26  
28  
30  
32  
34  
36  
38  
40  
42  
44  
46  
48

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Pittman at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present; Holcomb, Russo, Hanrahan and Pittman (Harper, Potts & Davis absent).

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Approval of Minutes for the March 15, 2007 meeting.**

Board member Hanrahan motions to table the minutes of the March 15, 2007 meeting due to lack of board members present to vote.

Board Member Russo seconded the motion to table the minutes of the March 15, 2007 meeting.

The motion passes 4 to 0 (Harper, Potts and Davis Absent).

Chairperson Pittman started the meeting off with H2007-003 because the applicant for SGN2007-0043 was not yet present.

Chairperson Pittman introduced the next agenda item.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**H2007-003: Hold a public hearing and consider a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (CofA) from John Mitchell for a detached garage located in the rear yard of 608 Washington Street (B F Boydston; Block 46). The tract is zoned (SF-7) Single Family district and identified as a "Medium Contributing Property".**

Chairperson Pittman introduced the item and asked staff to comment.

Mr. Spencer gave the staff report.

Chairperson Pittman asked about noticing neighbors.

Mr. Mitchell listed the neighbors he had discussed the proposed garage with.

Board member Russo asked the applicant if he was in agreement with staff recommendations.

Mr. Mitchell agreed that he was.

Board member Russo asked the applicant about his intentions for the parking area in the front of the garage.

Mr. Mitchell responded that there is an area for backing up and could also be used for a parking spot.

2 Board member Hanrahan comments that the drawing is not to scale and asked for a  
survey to scale to see the proportions before they make a decision.  
4 Mr. Mitchell gives an explanation of his current drawing and agrees to provide a drawing to  
scale to the board for their review.

6 Board member Hanrahan mentioned doing additional notifying.

8 Mr. Mitchell agreed and explained his screening plans for the garage.

10 Board member Hanrahan asked the applicant if he was the owner of the property.

12 Mr. Mitchell responded that he was not and that they had a contract pending on the  
approval of the CofA for the garage.

14 Board member Russo asked the applicant if he would be willing to bring in a revised  
16 drawing with better dimensions and asked what time scale they were on.

18 Mr. Mitchell stated that they planned on building the garage before moving in, and that  
they planed on closing in less than a month, before the next HPAB meeting.

20 Chairperson Pittman discussed what the Ordinance says about garages and additional  
22 notification.

24 Chairperson Pittman offered to hold a special meeting to review the revised, to scale  
drawings, of the proposed garage.

26 Staff commented that the Ordinance does not mention a notice requirement.

28 Board member Hanrahan requested that the Public Hearing be continued until the board is  
30 able to review a revised to scale drawing of the site.  
Board member Holcomb seconded the motion to table.  
32 The request is approved by a vote of 4 to 0 (Davis, Potts & Harper Absent)

34 **ACTION ITEMS**

36 **SGN2007-0043: Discuss and review a request from Mark and Sharon Steele for a detached**  
38 **sign located at 906 N. Goliad and take any action necessary.**

40 Chairperson Pittman introduced the item and asked staff to comment.

42 Miss Ryan presented the staff memo.

44 The applicant, Mark Steele, addressed the board.

46 Chairperson Pittman asked about plans for lighting.

48 Board member Hanrahan asked where on the property the sign would be located.

2 Mr. Spencer stated that someone from either Code Enforcement or Engineering would  
4 come out and make sure the sign was not in the right of way.

4 Board member Russo made a motion to approve the proposed sign.  
6 Board member Hanrahan seconded the motion to approve the sign.  
8 The sign was approved by a vote of 4 to 0. (Davis, Potts & Harper Absent)

8 **Miscellaneous discussion of Historical District issues**

10 The board discussed Founders Day  
12 The board discussed the north and east blocks of downtown  
14 The board discussed the status update for the North Goliad Historic District  
14 The board discussed the status of the Downtown zoning.

16 **ADJOURNMENT**

18 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

20 These minutes were approved on May 17, 2007.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Board Meeting  
May 1, 2007**

2

4

**CALL TO ORDER**

6

The meeting was called to order by Hanrahan at 6:18 p.m. with the following members present; Holcomb, Potts and Harper (Pittman, Russo & Davis absent).

8

**ACTION ITEMS**

**H2007-003: Hold a public hearing and consider a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (CofA) from John Mitchell for a detached garage located in the rear yard of 608 Washington Street (B F Boydston; Block 46). The tract is zoned (SF-7) Single Family district and identified as a "Medium Contributing Property".**

16

Vice Chairperson Hanrahan introduced the item and continued the public hearing.

18

Vice Chairperson Hanrahan asked the applicant if he would be willing to move the structure behind the house into the back yard.

20

Mr. Mitchell stated that he did not wish to do that because it would take up the space used for the back yard and that they were considering putting in a pool in that area.

24

Board member Potts commented that the applicant had renovated another historic home in the district and that he had been very successful with the other property. He also stated that he believed the submitted elevations of the proposed garage were appropriate for the property.

26

28

Board member Harper agreed that the proposed garage was appropriate for the property and that the location was the best placing on the lot so that the back yard could still be enjoyed.

30

32

Mr. Ron Rich, residing at 202 S. Clark St., appeared on behalf of Mr. Mitchell and stated that he had reviewed the proposed garage and was supportive of the new construction.

36

Vice Chairperson Hanrahan closed the public hearing and called for a vote.

38

Board member Potts made a motion to approve the CofA.

40

Board member Harper seconded the motion to approve.

The CofA passed by a vote to 3 to 0 (Hanrahan Abstained) (Russo, Pittman, & Davis absent)

42

**Miscellaneous discussion of Historical District issues**

44

**ADJOURNMENT**

46

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:31 p.m.

48

These minutes were approved on May 17, 2007.



**Historic Preservation Advisory Board Meeting  
May 17, 2007**

2  
4  
6  
8  
10  
12  
14  
16  
18  
20  
22  
24  
26  
28  
30  
32  
34  
36  
38  
40  
42  
44  
46

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Pittman at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present; Hanrahan, Holcomb, Potts, Russo and Harper (Davis absent).

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Approval of Minutes for the March 15, 2007 meeting.**

Board member Hanrahan requested that on pg. 3 line 6, David be changed to Davis.

Board member Hanrahan made a motion to approve with the changes  
Board member Harper seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved by a vote of 4 to 0 (2 abstained) (1 Absent)

**Approval of Minutes for the April 19, 2007 meeting.**

Board member Hanrahan requested that on pg. 3 line 6, she did not mention doing addition notifying, she requested to do additional notifying. And on line 29 when she made the motion, part of the motion was for staff to notify neighbors and that a special meeting be called to consider the continuation of the public hearing.

Chair-person Pittman requested that notice be changed to notify.

Board member Russo made a motion to approve the minutes with changes.

Board member Holcomb seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved by a vote of 4 to 0 (2 abstained) (1 Absent)

**Approval of Minutes for the May 1, 2007 meeting.**

Board member Hanrahan mentioned pg.1 line 22 which stated that Mr. Mitchell said he didn't want to add additional concrete because of the extra cost, and that his primary motivation was money. Mr. Rich did not appear on behalf of Mr. Mitchell but he had spoken to Mrs. Mitchell (Mr. Riche's neighbor at 204) and that she had no objection. Hanrahan did not call for a vote, but for a motion.

Chair-person Pittman stated that the comment that Mr. Mitchell had done another historic property in the neighborhood, was something that she was not aware of. She stated that he owns a rental property on Williams St. that has never been renovated.

Board member Potts stated that was his comment and that he had met with Mr. Mitchell about that property and he was under the impression that was his work.

2 Chair-person Pittman stated that he did come before the board for the concrete front yard  
and that was one of the only cases that staff had ever spoken out against, not in favor.  
4 She stated that the people on the board couldn't get past safety issues even though they  
were instructed to not look at the safety. It still got passed but he had done no renovations.  
6 She continued to state that on line 28-30 the word "appropriate" was used, and in her  
opinion that word means historically appropriate and that's not really the case here, since  
that insinuates the C of A is appropriate, that another word should be used.

8 Board member Potts stated it was a positive opinion.

10 Board member Hanrahan said she thought the intention was "suitable". She said she was  
12 trying to think of another word to use instead of appropriate. Given the site location of the  
house and the garage, it was a suitable location.

14 Chair-person Pittman stated that because neither Potts nor Harper has had design review  
16 training, they were at a disadvantage. She stated that they did not have training on how to  
review a design for C of A.

18 Mr. Spencer stated that minutes are what was actually said, and not the intent of what was  
20 said.

22 Chair-person Pittman stated that she would like the board not use appropriate in the future.

24 Board member Potts made a motion to approve the minutes with changes.

Board member Harper seconded the motion to approve.

26 The minutes were approved by a vote of 4 to 0 (2 abstained) (1 Absent)

## 28 **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

30 Discuss the creation of the North Goliad Overlay District

32 Chair-person Pittman stated that she was disappointed that Robert was not there, and  
asked Mr. Spencer if he had a report for this.

34 Mr. Spencer gave a brief report of the North Goliad Historic District and mentioned the  
P&Z joint work session on May 29, 2007.

36 Chair-person Pittman asked for comments how to proceed with the discussion.

38 Board member Hanrahan stated that she was extremely disappointed that Robert was not  
40 there. And that they had something of this magnitude that has been put before the board  
and P&Z , that the board and staff have worked on and to have the Historic Officer not  
42 show up at the HPAB meeting is bad. She asked of the 3 public hearings listed, which one  
was going to notify the property owners within 200 ft. of property being rezoned?

44 Mr. Spencer stated that a notice would go out for the actual amending of the Old Town  
46 District.

2 Board member Hanrahan stated that she was concerned because when she read the  
3 ordinance and they should be notified within 200 ft. all the time when there is a public  
4 hearing item. She heard Michael Hampton say at the P&Z meeting the HPAB does not  
5 hold public hearings where property is rezoned and Robert agreed, and as she understood  
6 it that is definitely not true. She stated that she was very concerned that Historic Board  
7 meetings are not being publicized and that property owners within 200 ft. are not being  
8 notified of what is happening in the district.

9  
10 Chair-person Pittman stated that no, wait a minute, we just held two public hearings on  
11 Olive Street and North Fannin. She stated that we just held public hearings on zoning  
12 changes.

13 Chair-person Pittman stated that they just want to find some consistency.

14 Board member Harper asked if they could continue this discussion when Robert was there,  
15 and that this was the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting in a row he's missed.

16  
17 Chair-person Pittman stated she thought it was the forth.

18  
19 Board member Hanrahan stated that there were a lot of issues here and a lot of things  
20 missing from the packet.

21  
22 Mr. Spencer asked what was missing.

23  
24 Board member Hanrahan stated that the packet referred to "exhibit A' that was not there  
25 and a list of properties was not there.

26  
27 Mr. Spencer responded that exhibit A is a legal description, meets and bounds, and it is  
28 not done until the boundaries are set.

29  
30 Board member Hanrahan stated that it would be appropriate to put a note in the packet  
31 that states that.

32  
33 Chair-person Pittman stated that she got a phone call from Mayor Cecil this morning and  
34 he was aware that they had no council liaison and that it would be done at the first meeting  
35 in June. She asked for a motion.

36  
37 Mr. Spencer stated that he urged the board to write down some comments concerning the  
38 North Goliad document.

39  
40 Board member Harper stated that it was a good idea to have parties there that could  
41 address rather than talk without being able to get anywhere.

42  
43 Board member Hanrahan stated she agreed. She said that she had spent a lot of time on  
44 this and that she was not inclined to spin her wheels much more without getting sensible  
45 answers. She said she had some problems with the sequencing, and some total  
46 conceptual problems with the document. She stated that as this point they don't have any

2 staff input or support. She stated that they don't have any council input and that she would  
move to table this item to the June meeting.

4 Board member Harper stated that the joint work session with P&Z was scheduled for May  
29. He asked if they were to table till June, would there be conflict with that.

6 Board member Hanrahan stated that was a tentative schedule and it is hard for half of a  
8 party to schedule a meeting. She stated that since P&Z knew before that meeting that's  
10 what they were going to propose that they could have contacted them so people could look  
at their calendars and people could come to this meeting prepared. She stated that there  
had been a lack of communication.

12 Chair-person Pittman stated that this document was presented to the P&Z either 3 or 4  
14 months ago.

16 Board member Hanrahan said it had been at the P&Z a long time and she was present at  
the P&Z meeting Tuesday before last and they had talked about it and all knew about it  
18 and amended something about the lights. She said that they certainly talked about it a long  
time and as a courtesy they could have notified the board earlier and said hey heads up  
20 guys this is what we're planning so I'm concerned with the lack of communication here.  
She stated that she felt that they have thrown this over the wall as opposed to passing and  
22 communicating and working together.

24 Board member Potts stated that obviously there was some animosity issues and he  
thought a few people on this board have a had bad taste in their mouth, maybe rightfully so  
26 and he is not one to judge, but they are to work with the P&Z and if they go into this with  
their chest bowed up and ready for a fight they're really not going to get anywhere. He said  
28 that a lot of these things are valid points but that they need to look at the big picture and  
not knit pick all the small things but that they should pick their battles. He stated that the  
30 P&Z might be thinking the same kinds of things as them, and saying that the Historic  
Board is ridiculous and what they want to do is out of the question. He said it was up to  
32 them to try to convey to them in an educating manor what they want to do instead of being  
extremely defensive and not forthcoming. He apologized if he stepped on any ones toes  
34 and said that it seemed like there was a lot of anger in the group.

36 Chair-person Pittman said that she would love to know how to approach the P&Z in an  
educating way but she didn't believe it was possible at this point. She said she had been  
38 researching and had passed it along to Mary and Robert and she had hoped he would  
have passed it along, about the historic district. She said there is good information on the  
40 net about using a historic overlay zone in addition to historic districts. She said she had a  
lot of change of heart about just totally saying no to a historic overlay district. She  
42 mentioned that she had some good information about what is going on in Connecticut. She  
said that she hoped they could maybe begin to find some common ground but that she  
44 thought they needed some time.

46 Board member Potts said that even though he had not been to any training, when he  
looked at the document proposal it differed but that he didn't see it as out of the question  
48 for what they wanted to accomplish. He stated that the P&Z had pinpointed certain

properties that they deemed suitable. Discussing the landmarking issue at council has been the only proposition council has had in a public setting.

Chair-person Pittman stated that they originally went to council to get approval and ask permission for forming the North Goliad Historic District. She said that they voted unanimously for approval, and that is the vote that they spent all the time on and that's where the animosity comes from. She mentioned all the money they paid Chris, Leslie and Robert and all the volunteer hours that they put in and that its all thrown out. She said that she was perfectly willing to look at this and that she had the files from Connecticut. She stated that there were some things that she had problems with – using an old outdated survey on the properties is out of line. She said they have a lot of common ground to negotiate and that the board hasn't been given time or the resources to look at the document. They got it this week when the P&Z had it for months, and that she didn't think it would hurt anyone to slow down and let them catch up.

Board member Russo stated that he though they needed to make some kind of compromise, and asked Mr. Spencer what could they do that would get things moving forward and get a good start.

Mr. Spencer answered that what staff was looking for that night was to address issues the board has with the document even though did may not be able to come up with solutions that night. He said that between then and the joint work session they could provide some feedback.

Board member Russo said that they had been working on the NGHDG for over a year now and since Jason Potts has been on the board this has been one of their projects. That N. Goliad is progressing with or without the document, and that N. Goliad is changing and taking a life of its own whether they do this or not. He mentioned the animosity, passion and frustration and said that should be put all aside, and that he agreed with Mr. Potts because the need to move this forward and give something to Chris because delaying now is only going to jeopardize this project and North Goliad.

Board member Hanrahan stated that one of her concerns was that they do not have a historic preservation officer that is dedicated to the board and whose only hat in the city is this board. They have a HPO that has no historic preservation training and experience and is also the chief planner over the Planning and Zoning Dept. She said it is hard to feel that they have any staff support for work they need done. She said the Sherry and herself spend an enormous amount of personal time working and researching these guidelines, members of the board have read through many copies and marked them up. One night they spent 2.5 hours going through the document page by page deciding what they did and didn't want and recommended it to P&Z only to have it discarded. She said they are the recommending board for historic preservation and then they were told they were going to start with something else. She said she personally did not have the time or inclination to spend 20 or 30 hours for several weeks in a row to have a joint work session with P&Z and be told that they didn't want that document. She stated that she has no feeling where they are going with this and that she has a lot of hesitation to spend any time on it. She has enthusiasm to protect N. Goliad and the Historic District of the city but that this proposal does not do that. She said she is really concerned about this proposal and that she

believes those comments would be better in a joint meeting with P&Z and that they need to get support and move forward. She said that she agrees with Sherry that they have a new survey and pictures, and with those together she didn't understand why the P&Z's proposal goes back to 1999 information. That seems entirely inappropriate.

Chair-person Pittman addressed Mr. Spencer and stated that she didn't see where this would go if they gave corrections at that meeting when they were only 12 days away from the work session. She asked why didn't we do it at that time so that we have time to put their thoughts together.

Mr. Spencer said that they don't need to formulate a fix all at that time but to figure out a base structure and common ground to take forward to P&Z.

Board member Russo mentioned holding off another month because there would be a new Council liaison to give them direction.

Mr. Spencer stated that because this was an important issue they didn't want it to get lost in the queue because there are so many large projects coming down the pipes. He mentioned starting work on the downtown zoning and that was very likely to continue on for a few meetings.

Board member Russo stated that the two might go hand in hand from the perspective of the Council.

Chair-person Pittman agreed and said that there would be 2 new council members and because this is an important project they should have more time to absorb the large scope of what is going on in the downtown area and N. Goliad area.

Board member Hanrahan stated that there are going to be a number of new P&Z commissioners that they should want to get on board rather than stepping in the middle and that they may have a different opinion, and that they were better waiting for the new P&Z members.

Mr. Spencer added that the reappointments don't occur until Aug/Sept and that they won't want to wait that long to take this forward, but that if the board deemed a little extra time to get the council settled, he believed that would be fine.

Chair-person Pittman asked if they needed a motion.

Mr. Spencer answered that it was just a discussion item and that they want to get a consensus on whether the board wants to set a joint session with P&Z on the 29<sup>th</sup> so they can let the commission know and post agenda.

Board member Russo stated that he was very comfortable with having the joint work session this month but was it possible to get that the next month.

2 Mr. Spencer answered that if they waited till next month it would go to P&Z on the 2<sup>nd</sup>  
meeting on June 26<sup>th</sup>. And that if the board was ok with that staff would check with P&Z  
and see if they're ok with that as well.

4 **Miscellaneous discussion of Historical District issues**

6 Board member Russo stated that he is concerned and dismayed that the historic  
8 preservation officer was not there. He said that they are held to the law and that if they  
miss three meeting they are off the board and that the HPO officer had not attended 3  
10 meetings in a row. It is a bad precedent. He said the he appreciated everyone being there.

12 Chair-person Pittman asked if they thought they could fire their preservation officer.

14 Board member Russo said that was not what he was there for and that is not what he  
wanted to say or do.

16 Board member Potts asked about the land-marking option and how it would effect new  
18 construction.

20 Mr. Spencer answered that it would be just like it is on the west side of the street they  
would have to come in for a C of A approval.

22 Board member Potts added that they would have a sense of influence over keeping the  
24 character of North Goliad.

26 Mr. Spencer answered yes.

28 Chair-person Pittman stated that there is no protection, and that a land-marked property  
does not have protection of what happened within 200 ft. of it. If in a historic district there is  
30 protection from what goes on around you.

32 Board member Potts stated that since being on there board there were 4 times that they  
have called for a vote and an abstention was made, he used Mary's abstention from the  
34 last meeting as an example. He asked what that meant if a board member abstains that  
has the same information that has been presented to all the board members, because  
36 when people come to them for a decision he said the thought they should give them the  
courtesy of giving them an answer.

38 Board member Hanrahan said that she abstained because she felt she couldn't vote for it  
40 because it destroyed the historic façade of the building and she wasn't so much against it  
to vote against it but couldn't vote for it. And she said that sometimes there are things you  
42 agree with and sometimes you disagree with and sometimes not. She said that since they  
were doing a show of hands because they weren't in the council chambers she knew it  
44 wasn't going to make a difference with a hand show whatsoever. She said that she  
probably would have abstained in the council chambers too. She said that it's like  
46 abstaining to vote for someone running for office because you don't know anything about  
them.

Chair-person Pittman asked if there was anything else.

2

**ADJOURNMENT**

4

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

6

These minutes were approved on July 19, 2007.



**Historic Preservation Advisory Board Meeting  
July 9, 2007**

2

4

**CALL TO ORDER**

6

The meeting was called to order by Pittman at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present; Potts, Davis, Russo and Harper (Holcomb absent).

8

**ACTION ITEMS**

12

**Z2007-012: Downtown (DT) District Rezoning**

14

**Consider a City-initiated request to rezone land of approximately 71.88-acres from Central Business (CBD) District, General Retail (GR) District, Single Family Residential (SF-7) District, Neighborhood Services (NS) District, Multi-Family Residential (MF-14) District, Planned Development No. 50 (PD-50) District, and Planned Development No. 55 (PD-55) District, to Downtown (DT) District in accordance with the City's approved Downtown Plan, and take any action necessary. The 71.88-acre (+/-) subject property is located in the downtown area of the City of Rockwall, Rockwall County, Texas and shall be incorporated as the Downtown Regulating Plan Boundary.**

16

18

20

22

Chair-person Pittman introduced the agenda item.

24

Mr. Lacroix gave a full report of the item and welcomed questions and asked the board to make their recommendations.

26

The board discussed the borders and dimensions of the regulating plan.

28

Chair-person Pittman asked what the property at 310 Washington St. was.

30

Mr. Lacroix answered that it was the building just east of the printing business.

32

Board member Davis asked what is defined by the form based zoning would be applicable to all the downtown area under that plan.

34

36

Mr. Lacroix answered yes.

38

Board member Russo mentioned considering the historical significance of the Rockwall and the spring well at 301 Washington.

40

Board member Potts asked staff to explain how the properties that are offices will be treated, if differently.

42

44

Mr. Lacroix answered that they would not be affected, that the downtown form based zoning focuses on redevelopment. If someone wanted to redevelop they would have to abide by the form based downtown zoning. He stated that there was a lot to do with the design elements and redevelopment, and that the building design gives the developer

46

2 more flexibility without having to deal with rezoning, which all promotes multi uses in the  
Downtown area.

4 Chari-person Pittman welcomed comments from the audience members.

6 Carol Crow – 504 Williams

8 Mrs. Crow addressed the board and discussed the form based zoning. She said that she  
wants to be able to be notified about what is happening in Old Town and also that she  
wants to be able to oppose proposed uses. Mrs. Crow spoke about her concerns with  
10 Lofland Park and that this plan might impact that area negatively. She said that she wants  
the square renovated and preserved but that she does not want urban renewal.

12 Johnny Johnson – 303 N. Clark & 307 E. Kaufman

14 Mr. Johnson stated that he feels the “Old Town” residents are losing control and the he  
doesn’t want boards or other entities to ruin their neighborhood. He said that he was not  
16 supporting the plan to go into effect.

18 Pat May – 308 Williams St.

20 Ms. May discussed with the board her past experiences in the Historic District and the  
Board. She said that she doesn’t want neighboring properties to hers be granted a zoning  
change that would allow commercial businesses. She said that she opposed that  
22 something be imposed by people who don’t live here in Rockwall. Ms. May discussed that  
some people’s opinion of progress may not come into line with other people. She  
24 mentioned in closing that using the city cable channel might be a better way to  
communicate with the citizens.

26 Mr. Lacroix mentioned that we use the website tool most often, but that we could look into  
28 using the cable channel.

30 Mary Hanrahan – 201 S. Clark

32 Mrs. Hanrahan stated that she was there to ask the board to not get rid of this downtown  
zoning all together, that we all agree that we need to revitalize the downtown and do  
something with it. She stated that she had 2 concerns, the first that the number of  
34 residential properties being taken into this new commercial zoning, and second the  
properties that borders Lofland Park. She requested that if approved the residential  
36 properties be removed because there had been so many residential structures removed  
from the district.

38 Debbie Wines – 310 Williams St.

40 Ms. Wines states her opposition to her neighbors changing to a commercial zoning district,  
and that she was concerned about the new district because she wants to be notified about  
42 any changes.

44 Chair-person Pittman called for comments from the board.

46 Board member Potts said that if the properties on Kaufman St. were removed and a  
developer came in to develop, they would have to come before the board for a C of A.

48

2 Board member Russo mentioned taking out the properties on North Fannin and Williams St. (Smitty's and Tropical Johns)

4 Chair-person Pittman discussed Fannin Street and the distinctive curves of the street. Pittman further discussed her concerns about the properties on Kaufman, the properties  
6 on S. Fannin, and would rather not see the condos included in the district. She said that going down to 310 Washington is to far in her opinion.

8 Board member Harper mentioned the Kaufman St. properties and Lofland Park. He agreed  
10 the concern about the curve on Fannin St., and said also that he was worried about it becoming a parking lot if not preserved.

12 Board member Russo stated that it makes sense to have City Hall downtown and Town  
14 homes connecting to it. It makes sense to have the Downtown district go to Storrs as a border.

16 Mr. Lacroix gave an explanation that if the town homes are included that the multifamily  
18 zoning would be replaced with urban residential.

20 Carol Crow - 504 Williams  
22 Mentioned Plano and all the apartments (multi-use developments) there and asked whether that was going to happen.

24 Mr. Lacroix responded that there is feasibility to that and it does not include your typical  
26 "garden apartments". Mr. Lacroix explained in order to do something like you see in Plano you would need at least an entire city block and the smaller residential lots are envisioned  
28 for some town home type uses. He said we are seeking some more downtown density and the possibility for that, the vision of the plan is to get some vitality there to keep people  
30 who want to live and shop there.

32 Ms. Crow again mentioned the park and wanting it to stay private and not wanting commercial and retail backing up to it.

34 Mr. Lacroix discussed the downtown plan further and not moving into the residential areas,  
36 while providing opportunity to develop areas and revitalize the downtown square.

38 Chair-person Pittman discussed North Goliad and stated that 802 N. Goliad has ruined the  
40 street, and that should have come before the Historic Board so they could have prevented the sea of concrete. She asked how they have insurance that they will be able to protect the citizens.

42 Mr. Lacroix said that it is in the ordinance and staff does their job to bring everything before  
44 the Historic Board that is under their jurisdiction.

46 Board member Potts asked if the condos on S. Fannin were within the district could someone be able to open an office in there.

2 Mr. Lacroix answered they would have to provide parking and abide by ADA, and that there isn't feasibility for that to happen there.

4 Board member Potts stated that there would probably have to be mass demo of the town homes in order to redevelop something there.

6 Mr. Lacroix said that yes, that would probably be the case.

8 Mike Pittman – 300 Munson

10 Mr. Pittman stated that he would offer a couple thoughts of sanity. He mentioned a neighborhood in Richardson that he couldn't recall the name of that is made up of cottages  
12 from the turn of the century that was in terrible condition and that over the last 15 years because of making it historical it is now charming. He said that those properties on  
14 Kaufman St. could be the same way, that there is no logical reason to include the town homes in the Downtown District.

16 Board member Russo stated that there are deed restrictions on the town homes. He also  
18 mentions again considering the rock wall that might be at 301 Washington property, as a what if.

20 Board member Davis stated that having worked really hard on the form based zoning, she  
22 was on board with all that is proposed. She asked what the thought behind including the properties on Kaufman was.

24 Mr. Lacroix responded that because we have ROW there it was a logical parameter and  
26 there has to be a certain amount of land available and it establishes opportunity for those home owners to do something with that property.

28 Board member Harper commented that Lofland park has been somewhat of a secret and it  
30 should be preserved.

32 Mr. Lacroix stated that we want the park to be pulled into this district as a green space and  
34 we would like to utilize it as such, and that there is some other property there that in the future we would like to use to expand the park, as a way to add more green space and trail area.

36 Chair-person Pittman said that one reason the park has been noticed is because the  
38 citizens have invested money into the park.

40 Mr. Lacroix said that the City has invested time and money into the park as well.

42 Board member Potts addressed the audience and board and discussed the proposed  
44 district and what they as a board want to recommend.

46 Chair-person Pittman said the town homes have turned into rentals and are basically apartments.

2 Board member Russo said the deed restrictions are making it very difficult to rent, and that  
the HOA is pushing for all home owners.

4 Chair-person Pittman asked Mr. Lacroix about the Downtown Historical Building Survey.

6 Mr. Lacroix stated that it was still in the works but that we were only looking at the down  
town zoning tonight.

8 Chair-person Pittman asked about the properties on Rusk.

10 Mr. Spencer stated that the only property that is included in the Downtown Plan on Rusk is  
12 landmarked.

14 Chair-person Pittman asked if they could limit expansion on Kaufman, east of Fannin and  
Washington, beyond what's already commercial, South Fannin and Denison Street.

16 Board member Potts asked for a compelling reason as to why they should include or  
18 exclude those properties north of Denison and south of Washington. Since they are  
historic they would have to come before the board on any changes that need to made.

20 Board member Davis made a motion to accept the boundaries as they are with the  
22 exception of the Kaufman properties.

24 Board member Russo seconded the motion.

26 Chair-person Pittman requested that 310 Washington be excluded and that Davis amend  
the motion.

28 Board member Davis amended the motion to accept the boundaries as they are with the  
30 exception of the Kaufman properties and 310 Washington be excluded.

32 Board member Russo seconds the amended motion.  
The item is approved by a vote of 5 to 0 (Holcomb absent).

34 **ADJOURNMENT**

36 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

38 These minutes were approved on September 20, 2007.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Board Meeting  
July 19, 2007**

2  
4  
6  
8  
10  
12  
14  
16  
18  
20  
22  
24  
26  
28  
30  
32  
34  
36  
38  
40  
42  
44  
46  
48

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Pittman at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present; Davis, Russo and Harper (Holcomb absent).

**Approval of Minutes for the May 17, 2007 meeting.**

Board member Harper made a motion to approve the minutes  
Board member Russo seconded the motion.  
The minutes were approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**H2007-006: Historic Dist Amendment (PD-50)  
Hold a public hearing and consider a city initiated request amending the Old Town Rockwall Historic District to remove properties located along the east side of North Goliad, and take any action necessary. The overall proposal is comprised of approximately 9.791-acres and includes those properties from 404 North Goliad to 912 North Goliad.**

Mr. Spencer presents the staff report and the details of the case.  
Board member Davis asked if some of the houses were still residential and some are businesses.

Mr. Spencer answered that was correct.

Mr. LaCroix said that the houses can be sold and still be residential, it's not until they cease being a residence that they can't be considered residential any more.

Chair-person Pittman discussed all the zoning that is applicable within the district.

Chair-person Pittman opened the public hearing.

Bonnie Lofland –  
Ms. Lofland asked what houses were going to be taken for the expansion of North Goliad (SH 205).

Mr. LaCroix explained the plans for the new cuplet and the properties to be removed.

Stewart Meyers – 1614 Lakeshore Dr.  
Mr. Meyers asked the board if the houses that are going to be removed from the district would still be under the Historic Board jurisdiction.

2 Mr. LaCroix said that the Historic Board would be acting like an architecture review board  
4 for new development based on the North Goliad Corridor Overlay guidelines. The board  
6 would review new development to ensure it is in conformance with the rest of the  
8 structures in overlay district. He stated that the Historic Board has more over-site now  
under the existing Historic District; looking at all façade changes to existing homes.  
Unless those homes were landmarked it would not be the same review process as the  
existing Historic District.

10 The board continued with discussion about the role of the Historic Board and the  
12 differences between the North Goliad Overlay and the Historic District.

14 Mr. Myers requested copies of the existing Historic District Guidelines and the proposed  
16 North Goliad Corridor Overlay District Guidelines.

18 A copy of the both the existing and proposed guidelines were distributed to those present.

20 Board member Russo suggested that an explanation be given to the audience of exactly  
22 what they're trying to do.

24 Mr. LaCroix gave a thorough explanation of the North Goliad Corridor Overlay District and  
26 how it compares to the existing Historic District. The proposed overlay would be a zoning  
28 mechanism for architectural style applying to both sides of North Goliad.

30 Brenda Meyers, Sterling Tea,- 506 North Golaid  
32 Mrs. Meyers explained to the board that when she opened her business there was a lot of  
34 confusion. It was very difficult to meet the ADA regulations while still keeping the historic  
36 board content with the structures historical appearance. She stated that the North Goliad  
area is definitely going in the commercial direction and that the Historic Board should focus  
on other historical areas that will remain historic.

38 Board member Russo asked about the large property that doesn't have any street frontage  
40 and why that was included.

42 Mr. LaCroix responded that it is 2 tracts but 1 piece of property, and it has 1 owner. He  
44 said that there could be potential for cross access and parking there.

46 Jim Moore – 704 N. Goliad  
48 Mr. Moore agreed that both sides of the street should be under the same zoning.

Mr. Spencer reminded the audience that this would not be the only public hearing, and that  
the case would also be going to Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Meyers said that he briefly read through the documents and that he didn't see a  
tremendous amount of difference and before the board should vote the public should know  
the major differences and that maybe that could be done with a bulleted document. He  
stated that he didn't want to replace their current zoning with something that would be  
more restrictive and that would make it more difficult to conduct their business.

2 Mr. LaCroix said that if a property is not in the Historic District one doesn't have to get a C  
4 of A. The only time that the Historic Board would review an application for an existing  
6 structure under the proposed overlay would be if there were changes to the building  
facade. ADA would take precedent over the historic district guidelines. He said that only if  
the properties were landmarked would they be subject to the Historic District Guidelines.

8 There was more discussion about the overlay district.

10 Mr. Meyers stated that because North Goliad is the North Entrance to the city and with all  
12 the growth up north, he thought it would be counter productive to limit the natural  
progression of the area.

14 Mr. LaCroix said that this is just a guideline for how the area is going to look, but what he  
16 thought Mr. Meyers was concerned about was the permitted uses within Planned  
Development No. 50 (PD-50). He said that would be an issue for the Council to look at and  
consider in the future.

18  
20 Board member Davis stated that we have to take homes along North Goliad out of the  
Historic District first, to make it so that people are able to change their siding, to make it  
22 look somewhat more like a business but within this overlay so that that area remains  
quaint and charming. That if someone demolished a house, this document makes it so that  
24 they would have to come in and we would make sure it looked like it should. She said this  
should make it easier to conduct businesses along that corridor but maintain the look. She  
mentioned how they had worked very hard for over a year to get all this together.

26  
28 Chair-person Pittman commented that both an overlay district and a historic district can be  
preservation tools, it's just as long as they get there.

30 Board member Russo commented that the proposed guidelines clean up the situation and  
32 makes it more neighbor and community friendly. He agreed that they had spent a lot of  
time working on this document and that they really wanted the best thing for the area.

34 Chair-person Pittman closed the public hearing

36 Board member Russo made a motion to approve the Amendment to the "Old Town  
Rockwall" Historic District.

38 Board member Davis seconded the motion to approve.  
The item was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

40  
42 Chair-person Pittman introduced the next item on the agenda

**H2007-007: 608 Washington (Detached Garage & Drive)**  
44 **Hold a public hearing and consider a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness**  
46 **(CofA) from John Mitchell for modifications to an approved detached garage located**  
48 **in the rear yard of 608 Washington Street St (B F Boydston; Block 46). The tract is**  
**zoned (SF-7) Single Family district and identified as a "Medium Contributing**  
**Property".**



2 Mr. Spencer presented the staff report and gave details to the revised site plan.

4 There was discussion about the height of the structure and Mr. Spencer stated that as per  
6 the Unified Development Code the maximum height was 15 ft. and that was measured  
8 from the midpoint of the roof pitch.

8 Mr. Mitchell addressed the board and presented the change of plans and reasons for  
10 wanting to make modifications to the structure.

12 Board member Russo asked about the door on the second level.

14 Mr. Mitchell answered that they needed to store things up there and that they couldn't get it  
16 up the attic stairs.

18 Board member Russo asked if they were planning on getting electricity and plumbing to  
20 the structure.

22 Mr. Mitchell answered that they were planning on getting electricity but no plumbing.

24 Board member Russo stated his concern about the door and stated that he understood  
26 there was work going-on on his back patio.

28 Mr. Mitchell responded that no sir, there was not.

30 Board member Harper asked where the stairs would go.

32 Mr. Mitchell answered that there were no stairs but they had thought about a spiral stair  
34 case.

36 Board member Russo asked why he would want a spiral stair case that would make it  
38 more difficult to carry things upstairs.

40 Mr. Mitchell answered that was why he hadn't followed through with the idea.

42 There was some further discussion about the possible stairs.

44 Mr. LaCroix said that no separate meters would be allowed and that the area couldn't be  
46 used for rental space.

48 Board member Harper asked if there were stairs present, would they be visible from the  
street.

Mr. Mitchell answered no.

Chair-person Pittman stated that she would recommend approval for C of A if Mr. Mitchell  
would agree to not put an outdoor staircase or ever use it as a rental property.

2 Mr. Mitchell answered that it couldn't be used as a rental because the single family zoning  
4 doesn't allow it and that he had zero want to use that as a rental.

6 Board member Russo said that someone told him that Mr. Mitchell was adding a bathroom  
8 to the back of his house.

10 Mr. Mitchell said that there is no construction going on behind his house.

12 Board member Russo responded that he was going by what he had been told.

14 Mr. Mitchell said that ultimately he would like some stairs to access that door at some  
16 point.

18 Chair-person Pittman asked if the stair case would have to be covered.

20 Mr. LaCroix answered no, hand-railing or a certain pitch maybe required, but he was not  
22 aware of it having to be covered.

24 Board member Davis asked if the balcony required a railing and what materials should be  
26 used.

28 Mr. LaCroix answered that the wrought iron Mr. Mitchell suggested would be fine.

30 Chair person Pittman asked where the stairs would be.

32 Mr. Mitchell responded that they could come off the west or south down to the existing  
34 sidewalk.

36 Board member Harper asked if from a construction stand point were they in compliance.

38 Mr. LaCroix answered that yes they were, they were before the board because they're in  
40 the historic district.

42 Chair-person Pittman asked for any further questions and a motion.

44 Board member Harper made a motion to approve with the additional condition that the  
46 staircase not be visible from the street.

48 Board member Davis seconded the motion to approve.

The item passed by a vote of 3 to 1 (Russo against)

Chair-person Pittman introduced the next item.

## 44 **ACTION ITEMS**

### 46 **Z2007-018: PD-50 District Amendment**

48

2 **Consider a city-initiated amendment to (PD-50) Planned Development No. 50 district**  
4 **(Ord. 05-35), specifically to amend Section 2 "Conditions," and take any action**  
4 **necessary.**

6 Mr. Spencer presented the staff report, the details of the case and recommended approval  
of the item.

8  
10 There was some discussion about the meets, bounds and coordinates of the district.

12 Chair-person Pittman said that it is a natural follow-up to the removing of the properties.

14 Chair-person Pittman called for a motion.

16 Board member David made a motion to approve the item.

18 Board member Harper seconded the motion to approve  
The item passed by a vote of 4 to 0.

20 Chair-person Pittman introduced the next item.

22 **Z2007-019: North Goliad Overlay District**

24 **Consider a City initiated request to amend the Unified Development Code of the City**  
24 **of Rockwall by adding the following new section; Section 6.2-1 (NGC OV) North**  
24 **Goliad Corridor Overlay District, and take any action necessary.**

26 Mr. Spencer presented the board with the staff report and details of the case, and  
recommended approval of the item.

28  
30 There was some discussion about the large property with no street frontage.

32 Chair-person Pittman asked how they could make suggestions for change within the  
document.

34 Mr. LaCroix answered that they as a board could offer recommendations to P&Z.

36 There was further discussion about the guidelines and what is required for façade  
changes.

38  
40 Mr. LaCroix stated that we wanted enough flexibility to allow for ideas about how to new  
structures without duplicating these structures.

42 Chair-person Pittman requested to change some worked so as to not encourage  
duplication of homes.

44  
46 There was discussion about landscape screening of residential properties from commercial  
properties.

48 Board member Davis asked if when North Goliad is redone would it have sidewalks.

2 Mr. LaCroix answered that yes it would, that would be a public improvement project.

4 Chair-person Pittman stated that the building should be appropriate but not duplicated, and  
6 that they could change “generally fit within” to say, “shall recall historic themes but not  
attempt to replicate one or more”.

8 Board member Davis made a motion to approve with the rewording and have Chair-person  
Pittman present at P&Z.

10 Board member Harper seconded the motion to approve.  
The item was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

12

**Miscellaneous discussion**

14 Discussion about expanding the historic district.

16 **ADJOURNMENT**

18 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

20 These minutes were approved on September 20, 2007.

**Historic Preservation Advisory Board Meeting  
September 20, 2007**

2

4

**CALL TO ORDER**

6

The meeting was called to order by Pittman at 6:30 p.m. with the following members present; Whitley, Russo and Hoofnagle (West and Harper absent).

8

10 **Approval of Minutes for the July 9, 2007 meeting.**

12 Board member Russo made a motion to approve the minutes

Board member Pitman seconded the motion.

12

14 The minutes were approved by a vote of 2 to 0 (Whitley and Hoffnagle abstain).

14

16 **Approval of Minutes for the July 19, 2007 meeting.**

18 Board member Russo made a motion to approve the minutes

Board member Pitman seconded the motion.

18

20 The minutes were approved by a vote of 2 to 0 (Whitley and Hoffnagle abstain).

20

22 **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

24 **H2007-008: Landmark Designation for 912 North Goliad**

**Hold a public hearing to consider a request by George Stacey for a Historic Landmark designation for the Austin-Stacey House located at 912 N. Goliad. The tract is zoned (PD-50) Planned Development No. 50 and is located outside of the Old Town Rockwall Historic District and identified as a "High Contributing Property" with in the Historic survey.**

24

26

28

30

Mr. Spencer presents the staff report and the details of the case.

32

Chair-person Pittman opened the public hearing.

34

George Stacy, 912 North Goliad, addressed the board and requested that the application for Landmark Designation be approved

36

38 Chair-person Pittman closed the public hearing

40 Board member Russo made a motion to approve the Landmark Designation for 912 North Goliad.

42 Board member Whitley seconded the motion to approve.

The item was approved by a vote of 4 to 0.

44

Chair-person Pittman introduced the next item on the agenda

46

**H2007-009: 408 Munson (Detached Garage & Drive)**

**Hold a public hearing and consider a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness**

48

2 **(CofA) from Robert and Rita Norbury for a detached garage located in the rear yard**  
3 **of 408 Munson Street St (Eppstein, Block A, Lot Pt of 4 5 6). The tract is zoned (SF-**  
4 **7) Single Family district and identified as a "Medium Contributing Property".**

6 Mr. Spencer presented the staff report and gave details of the case.

8 Chair-person Pittman opened the public hearing.

10 Anthony Wilson, 133 Kirkhaven Drive, addressed the board representing the property  
11 owner and requested that the Certificate of Appropriateness for the detached garage be  
12 approved

14 Chair-person Pittman closed the public hearing

16 Board member Russo made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for a  
17 detached garage at 408 Munson with staff conditions.

18 Board member Hoofnagle seconded the motion to approve.

20 The item passed by a vote of 4 to 0

22 Chair-person Pittman introduced the next item.

### 24 **Miscellaneous discussion**

26 The board discussed changing the regularly scheduled HPAB meeting time from 6:30 to  
27 6:00 p.m.

28 Board member Russo made a motion to move the regularly scheduled HPAB meeting time  
29 from 6:30 to 6:00 p.m.

30 Board member Hoofnagle seconded the motion to approve.

32 The item passed by a vote of 4 to 0

### 34 **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

These minutes were approved on January 31, 2008.