

## MINUTES

**HISTORIC LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING OF  
SEPTEMBER 28, 2021**

The Historic Landmark Preservation Committee of the City of Lancaster, Texas, met in a Regular Session in the Council Chambers of City Hall on September 28, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. with a quorum present to-wit:

**Members Present:**

Patricia Siegfroid-Giles, Chair  
Dee Hinkle  
Glenn Hooper

**Members Absent:**

Paul Laurens Wiseman, Vice Chair  
Russell Webb  
Amy Glover

**City Staff:**

Vicki Coleman, Director of Development Services  
Bester Munyaradzi, Senior Planner  
Emma Chetuya, Planner

**Call to order:**

Chair Siegfroid-Giles called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. on September 28, 2021.

**Public Testimony:**

At this time citizens who have pre-registered before the call to order will be allowed to speak on consent or action items on the agenda, with the exception of public hearings, for a length of time not to exceed three minutes. Anyone desiring to speak on an item scheduled for a public hearing is requested to hold their comments until the public hearing on that item.

There were no speakers.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

Chair Siegfroid-Giles read the consent agenda.

1. **Consider approval of minutes from the Historic Landmark Preservation Committee Regular Meeting held on August 24, 2021.**

**MOTION:** Committee Member Hinkle made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Hooper to approve the consent agenda. The vote was cast 3 for, 0 against (Wiseman, Webb, Glover absent).

**ACTION**

2. **HLPC21-16 Discuss and consider a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to install a steeple on the building addressed as 107 Texas Street, Lancaster, Dallas County, Texas.**

# HLPC 60

Historic Landmark Preservation Committee

September 28, 2021

Page 2 of 4

Senior Planner Munyaradzi gave the staff report and stated that this is a request to install a 14 feet 7 inch steeple on the roof of the building. The steeple will be made of fiberglass and will be facing Texas Street. The height of the existing building is 14 feet and the total height of proposed steeple and the existing building will be 28 feet and 7 inches. The Downtown Overlay District allows a maximum building height of 35 feet, therefore the proposed steeple is in compliance with the allowable height. Note that the building exterior material is brick and it was painted contrary to Section 3.7.1 of the Historic District Regulations. The applicant has been notified that the exterior painting will need to go through the COA process. Staff recommends approval of the request to install the steeple as presented.

Dr. Kevin Norvell, pastor of the Redeemer Baptist Church and applicant, stated that the church seeks to be in compliance with the regulations.

**MOTION:** Committee Member Hooper made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Hinkle to approve item 2. The vote was cast 3 for, 0 against (Wiseman, Webb, Glover absent).

**3. HLPC21-17 Discuss and consider a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to install a wood and wrought iron fence on the property addressed as 312 N. Centre Street, City of Lancaster, Dallas County, Texas.**

Planner Chetuya gave the staff report and stated that the applicant is proposing to install a 6 feet high wood fence on a portion of the north, east and south sides of the lot as shown. The wood fence will be located approximately 2 feet from the sidewalk along East 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and the entire fence will be located in the rear 50% of the side yard. The wood fence will be stained a medium brown color. The applicant is proposing to install a six feet high black wrought iron fence on a portion of the east side of the lot. The proposed fences are in compliance with the Lancaster Historic Residential District Regulations (LHRDR) and staff recommends approval of the request as presented.

Porfirio Garcia, 312 N. Centre, applicant, explained the request.

**MOTION:** Committee Member Hooper made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Hinkle to approve item 3. The vote was cast 3 for, 0 against (Wiseman, Webb, Glover absent).

**4. HLPC21-18 Discuss and consider a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to paint the home on the property addressed as 427 South Centre, City of Lancaster, Dallas County, Texas.**

Planner Chetuya gave the staff report and stated that the applicant is requesting to paint the body of the home white and the trim black. The exterior material of the home is brick and the primer is already applied on all 4 sides of the home. According to the applicant, painting is needed because the replaced brick does not match with the existing brick. Section 3.7.1 of the regulations states that the original natural finish is historically important and should be preserved and original masonry surfaces shall not be painted. Should the painting of the masonry be approved, it should be in substantial compliance with the exhibit provided. Staff recommends denial of the request.

Muhammad Samad, 1218 Nocona Dr, Irving, applicant, explained the request for the brick to be painted in order for the new brick to match the existing. Mr. Samad explained that the brick used to rebuild portions of the house is the original brick. He stated that he and the prospective owner concluded that only the siding would be painted but there was miscommunication with the sub-contractors and they primed 70% of the brick within 3 hours. He also stated that he takes full responsibility.

Committee Member Hooper stated that the color of the new mortar does not match the mortar's existing color and recommends changing the mortar color.

Mr. Samad stated that the color of the new mortar is the same color of the existing mortar. The only difference is that that the old mortar has been there for decades and its color has changed. It is actually the new mortar and brick which do not match the color of the original mortar and brick.

Committee Member Hooper stated that the primary distinction is the difference in mortar color and that mortar is made in other colors besides gray.

Committee Member Hinkle stated that the new brick could have easily been painted or tinted to match the old brick. This is historic preservation.

Committee Member Hooper stated that chemicals might need to be used to wash off the paint and a tarp would need to be placed on the ground to collect whatever is washed off.

Mr. Samad stated that the brick has hundreds of deep perforations. He stated that he got an opinion from those who paint and no one has an answer to remove the paint.

Chair Siegfried-Giles stated that he was talking to the wrong people and there are artists in the North Texas area who can paint exterior bricks to match the main brick.

Mr. Samad stated that there are other homes in the historic district with white painted brick.

Committee Member Hinkle stated that we have an ordinance which clearly states that masonry houses in the Historic District shall not be painted. If other homes in the Historic District have been painted, it was prior to the initiation of the regulations.

Chair Siegfried-Giles stated that after laying some of the new brick, the applicant should have noticed that the color of the old and new brick did not match. The next course of action should have been to ask the Planning and Zoning staff how to proceed. She also stated that the Committee Members can only consider applicant statements and information provided in the packet. The material the applicant provided in the packet is irrelevant as the picture of the brick painted home provided in by the applicant is not in the Historic District and is unrelated to this case. The regulations explicitly state that historic masonry is not to be painted and painting the home is inappropriate.

Committee Member Hinkle stated that there were specialists trained in removing paint from historic properties.

# HLPC 62

Historic Landmark Preservation Committee

September 28, 2021

Page 4 of 4

**MOTION:** Committee Member Hinkle made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Hooper to deny the request to paint the brick and request that the existing primer be removed with the assistance/advice of a historic preservation specialist. The vote was cast 3 for, 0 against (Wiseman, Webb, Glover absent).

**MOTION:** Committee Member Hooper made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Hinkle to adjourn. The vote was cast 3 for, 0 against (Wiseman, Webb, Glover absent).

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 PM.

**ATTEST:**



\_\_\_\_\_  
Vicki Coleman, Director

**APPROVED:**



\_\_\_\_\_  
Patricia Siegfried-Giles, Chair