

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Tuesday, May 9, 2023
Meeting Minutes

Members Present:

Robert Manning.....Chairman
Bridget Trawhon..... Member
Codie Vasquez.....Member
Kenneth Wheeler.....Member

Members Absent:

Robin Craig-Hunt..... Vice Chair

Staff Present:

Kelvin Knauf, Director of Planning & Community Development
Divon Williams, Deputy Director of Planning & Community Development
Wendy Lloyd, Planning Secretary
Marvin Benoit, Building Official
Alison Clary, Communications/Marketing Coordinator

City Council Members Present:

Brad Childs

Chairman Manning called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Manning asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 11, 2023, regular meeting

Member Vasquez motioned

Member Trawhon 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

CITIZEN COMMENTS

None

PRESENTATION

Receive a presentation from Traylor and Associates concerning the Historical Preservation Commission’s participation in the City of Orange Housing Buyout Program

Mr. Knauf stated if you remember at the last meeting we received a letter from Traylor and Associates our consultants about the housing buyout program and whether the commission wanted to participate in that to voice an expression as to whether a parcel of property has any historic significance or not. There were some questions that came up during that discussion that we weren’t able to answer. So, we have Melinda Smith with Traylor & Associates and she’s just going to explain a little bit about the program and answer your questions.

Melinda Smith – Traylor & Associates: Ms. Smith stated basically the goal of the Buyout and Acquisition Program is to purchase properties that are located in a floodplain, floodway or even what could be a declared disaster risk reduction area by council. So, in other words, a place that may not actually be in a declared floodplain but received flooding, purchase those properties and hopefully remove people from the threat of future flooding in doing so. What we see a lot of times in cities this size in particular, after a storm housing stock is low and people come in and purchase a home that's been damaged at a reduced price as people have often gotten their insurance or FEMA payments, don't care what happens to the house and they'll sell it to a developer who will go in there and do some of the minimal repairs necessary and then rent it out to someone. Then the next storm comes and that new person is put in danger. So, kind of the ultimate goal of this program is help facilitate people disposing of properties that are repetitive flooded properties and risks and help remove the risk to people in the future. Dilapidated homes as you are aware are also a threat to health and public safety in the next flood. Even on a normal day they're a threat to public health and safety due to the increased risk of pests, varmints, insects. In Rose City recently I had a homeowner and I was there for something completely different and she was there to talk about the fact that the home next door to her and she couldn't outside to hang her laundry because every time she walked out the bugs were so bad and pests were running about onto her property. It is more than just an eyesore even. It is a threat to health and public safety. So that is one of the reasons that this program was created. It's a new program for the state of Texas. It was the first time it's rolled out. I will tell you that it has not been a hugely successful program for the state of Texas. The pandemic happened in the middle of the funds being released. There was a lot of hesitance for people to pick up and move. The pandemic has greatly affected home values and also in Orange County in particular you have the CP Chem expansion happening and housing has been becoming more and more of a commodity. The homes that are in this program that are choosing to participate and looking to participate, it should be understood that these are people who are trying to do the right thing. A lot of these homes could be sold with fewer hoops to jump through through just a private sale. A lot of times people move in from outside the area and have no idea the flooding history. After it's gone through a few sales sometimes that information gets lost. These people's lives would be easier if they just sold it privately. This is not an easy fix. It is not just sign a paper here and there. These homeowners have provided a significant amount of documentation in order to be eligible for this program. It is offering fair market value for the home. One of the requirements of the program is that it serves a low to moderate income objective. That's just a general HUD requirement for most of their programs. The city of Orange is an entitlement city. You actually do receive funds annually from HUD that you use for projects predominantly in low to moderate income areas. This is a similar program. The intent is to assist low to moderate income homeowners or areas. So, the city started off with an acquisition program. Now we have a buyout program. Under acquisition property can be redeveloped. Under acquisition you would have a requirement on the deed to elevate 2 feet above BFE using your most recent best known data and any future structures would be required to carry NFIP Flood insurance. The low to moderate income objective in that case is achieved in what we would call the back end. The repurposing of the property after the sale is what would be looking for to meet that low to moderate income objective. That could be a community garden in a neighborhood that's historically by survey and by census data determined to be low to moderate income. It could be a new home that is built, elevated of course. I have a problem with the point of program being to remove from a floodplain and then put them right back in it. That to me seems kind of conflicting. That also could be a developer, the city put any kind of low to moderate income housing could be built on that property and the renter/occupant/owner would be required to be low to moderate income. That was the beginning and the intent really was to redevelop that lot. Unfortunately, with the change in the housing market, builders have to put food on the table. Builders have to put food on the table because they are building much larger houses. They are not building affordable homes with a very narrow profit margin and they don't need to right now. They have enough work. So, finding people to work and put affordable housing especially in a spot by spot basis, that's really been the downfall of the program not just here but all over the state of Texas. The buyout program instead of achieving your low to moderate income objective on the back end would have you achieve it on the front end. So that would mean your homeowner or at least 70 percent of the dollars being spent in the program towards those homeowners would be low to moderate income eligible homeowners. That means that they meet HUD Section 3 income requirements and

qualify. Basically, it's 80 percent or less of the area's median income. That could be someone who's retired. It could be a family. It's based on the size of the household. There's a lot of times that people think there's no way that person is low to moderate income and reality is they very much are by HUD standards. The program was initially acquisition. It turns out the properties who had applied for participation and were deemed eligible, we did not have an end use on the back end that would qualify for the acquisition program. They were either not in an area that would meet the low to moderate income standard and then of course don't have anybody to build a home on the back end. So, we did switch very recently to a buyout program which does mean once a home is demolished, it will be forever green space in perpetuity. It will have a deed restriction placed on it that it will not have any kind of development that is even considered possible for habitation. Now there are a lot of different ways to use the space still. Recreation. It would be a city owned property and from that point a city maintained property unless the city chose to and again this is an option. It's not something that necessarily you have available right now and it's something you would want to speak to legal counsel about because there are liabilities with it. You could even lease it to the next door neighbor if they wanted to make sure it's maintained. They just wouldn't be able to build on it. Playground equipment, anything that's not habitable. There are some exceptions for restrooms at recreational areas. None of these areas are places you would want to stick some restrooms. One of the HUD suggestions is to create a safe space for drug addicts. I don't think that's anything anyone wants to do personally but that's one of their ideas. It can also be returned to natural vegetative state and nothing placed upon it. The property in particular that we are discussing tonight is the last home in the packet. There's pictures of it. It's 903 N 3rd Street. Just a little background, we were not the original firm that assisted the city in preparing this application. We were brought in after the project had already begun. The first firm did not do basically what was required or best practice would be during the broad level environmental review is contact THC and you all at that time. So now we are down to what we call site specific reviews, that's why you're receiving these letters at this time because it wasn't done during the broad level review. So, you will see if you haven't seen the others yet, it will be on a case by case basis that we're sending those to you as homeowner's qualify or are approved by the General Land Office. It takes several months for the GLO to come back after review and tell us whether or not someone is indeed going to receive funds and accept an offer and all those good things. This home in particular is in zone AE. It is in the floodplain. There's some pictures and the condition it is in. You can see there's some vegetative growth already. It looks like it's overtaking the roof. One of the concerns that HUD particularly has is are we removing affordable housing from the market and their determination of affordable housing is much different that I think what most of us would consider. Their looking at is this home able to be rehabbed at reasonable expense for someone to live. That requirement to prove that is waived for this program. Normally if we were going to demolish a home we have to replace it. This program does not have that stipulation mostly because it is associated with flooding rather than say in the middle of New York City where a lot of these rules and policies come from. It's designed for much more urban areas than rural Texas. Really the decision that we would be looking at and the reason we've asked for a consultation is, is there anything historically significant about this property? An example of something that wouldn't necessarily be if your best friend's uncle's brother lived there then that's great you have a personal connection. But is your best friend's uncle's brother someone of historical significance? Is there any action, person, anything tied to this property that we're aware of that could be something that we say hey there's reason to not demolish this home or this one is in particular is not in character with the rest of the neighborhood. It is in the historic district but is it necessarily the same style.

Chairman Manning stated did this used to be a commercial property. Ms. Smith stated it looks like it. Mr. Knauf stated I think probably at one time it probably was. It looks like one.

Mr. Benoit stated does the program are they going to do the asbestos surveys and abatement and everything? I'm not sure how you all are taking in this commercial property. Ms. Smith stated it's actually not listed as commercial. Mr. Knauf stated it's zoned residential. Mr. Benoit stated I know but on the appraisal district it was not commercial. Ms. Smith stated no. The property owner as certified that they owned it at the time of the flood. There has to be a tie to the flood and they have to be able to show that they were the owner of the property and it was a first residence

at the time of the flood. Mr. Benoit stated because it doesn't meet the requirements of a residential structure. There's no windows. There's no egress. Chairman Manning stated but you're saying it's zoned residential. Mr. Knauf stated yes. Chairman Manning stated it was probably zoned residential long before the floods. Mr. Knauf stated as a commercial enterprise its legal nonconforming that would have lost its grandfathered status because it's been vacant for more than a year. Chairman Manning stated for the agenda item we are on the presentation. We're going to discuss this property later in the agenda. Is your presentation complete? Ms. Smith stated are there any questions that I can answer?

Member Wheeler stated will this be designated strictly as green space? Ms. Smith stated open space, recreational space, green space. No habitable structure can be placed upon that property. Member Wheeler stated if completely around that location in the future a development begins, that will just have to be an empty space. Ms. Smith stated playground equipment could be placed on it, a park bench qualifies as a park, dog parks. There's a number of things it could be used for. Chairman Manning stated let's say anecdotally there's a development down there where they were going to put in a couple of GLO homes surrounding it on different properties, could that be used or can they petition the city and used as a park for that block or a parking area for that development. Ms. Smith stated yes. Chairman Manning stated so it still can be used. It just cannot have a dwelling on it. Ms. Smith stated correct. It can have a pavilion. It can have any number of parking spaces. There's no current provisions under the program for say a concrete parking lot being disallowed. Now there may be other ordinances under the city that might dictate 4x4 squares of concrete or something along those lines but as far as this program's standpoint that is not addressed as long as it is not a habitable structure then you're fine. Even though we switched to a buyout for the purpose of who we're benefiting, that doesn't mean you can't still use the property for some of the same uses you would have on the back end of the acquisition program. The only one that wouldn't be eligible is the affordable housing option. You could still use it as a community garden, as a dog park. I have several places who have the local FFA maintaining it. It takes the cost off of the city and it benefits the community. Chairman Manning stated but that use is regulated by the city. The city says if a developer comes in and says I want to lease this property for a dollar and I want to put a park here for my development. It's still usable and it's up to the city because it's their land or is the program? Ms. Smith stated it will be the city's land and I would make sure to talk to the city's legal because there are inherent liabilities with leasing city owned property. So, there may also be some municipal codes that would require some sort of equitable distribution. It may be that there are codes that say you have to auction it for someone to use it. I mean it's still a lease and you still have limited and the deed restrictions are still there. I would just make sure that the legal team would need to be discussing that. The city would determine the rules on how according to local/state laws.

Member Wheeler stated for future reference for us how do we tell what stipulations are left on it if it's strictly for green space or are all of them for future green space. I'm saying green space as something that cannot be habitable. Ms. Smith stated for this program we have currently, all of the properties involved would be perpetually green space. Chairman Manning stated ok so that's a deed restriction. Ms. Smith stated correct that is a requirement of the program as a buyout. Now if you were acquisition it can be redeveloped. Buyout it cannot and buyout is what the city currently has. Mr. Benoit stated so were there any restrictions on the owner. Were they going to buy another house in Orange or are you just giving them the money so they can go anywhere they want? Ms. Smith stated so that actually varies from place to place. There are no requirements in the City of Orange in this program that requires someone to stay in Orange. There's a couple reasons for this. The GLO did kind of feel like it can be viewed as an obstacle for fair housing particularly if you are encouraging someone who is low to moderate income to stay in what they consider an impoverished area. You all do not meet a citywide low to moderate income percentage of 51 percent or more so it's not a blatant disregard of that rule but you all are close enough to it that it would be frowned upon. This program currently does not provide housing on the backend. We do have some incentives that are available if someone can show that for instance they have a 3 bedroom, 2 bath 1500 square foot house that fair market value at the time of the storm it was \$150,000 home and now they cannot find something that is equitable then we can offer incentives to help them kind of bolster the price of their home plus make a new home that fairly

comparable affordable for them. Those incentives are extremely hard to qualify and they have very short time periods on them and most of them are not paid in advance. They're reimbursed and again it seems like something in thought was a pretty good idea but in execution it's just not something that a low to moderate household can afford to do in reality.

Council member Childs stated you were close to almost answering my question. You did say that a neighbor could rent the property for a dollar a year. Ms. Smith stated again as determined by the city. Councilmember Childs stated as determined by the city and let's say there's an oak tree left on the property and a child falls on it, who does the liability fall upon? Ms. Smith stated again that's something you want to visit with your legal counsel about and also that would be probably a determining factor in whether or not you chose to do that or legal language within the lease. Councilmember Childs stated we were kind of the understanding that no one could have the property. We didn't know we could lease it to somebody. Ms. Smith state correct you can't sell it but you can lease it. Mr. Knauf stated I'm not sure that was the same program on Huntwick as what this is. I'm not sure they're exactly the same program. We'd have to check that out. I wasn't involved in that one either. Ms. Smith stated we do generally make efforts to avoid what they call checkerboarding. This is checker boarding. We don't have a contingent area. I think if the pandemic had not happened in the middle of all this we would have a much different result in a lot of these areas but it happened and these are the households that are interested and none of them are near each other so it is a pain for maintenance. Councilmember Childs stated our concerns are taking care and maintenance of a vacant lot but we can lease it to someone but then we have the liability issue and you said that's back on counsel now. Ms. Smith stated correct legal would need to have input instigating a means for having that lease agreement.

Member Wheeler stated what about when you all do these are you looking about the possibility of land locking somebody in. Ms. Smith stated yes that is the title company's responsibility. These go through a title search and the same process that you would if you were purchasing or selling to a private investor. We did actually just run into that and we're still working that through. It's in another city, not here.

Member Vasquez stated but our role is to determine if it has historic significance. Ms. Smith stated correct. Member Vasquez stated so when a property comes up, does that go before council to approve? What I'm wondering in cases like land lock does the city have an opportunity to say no we don't want to do that with this property. Ms. Smith stated not really to be very honest with you. We of course share any issues that come up. It's an active conversation but once the housing guidelines are laid out which they have been, if you meet those qualifications you are eligible and the city has pretty much agreed that they will purchase the property provided obviously that it clears environmentally and that the offer price is agreed to. For the most part there is very little way for the city to say no we don't want to help you especially if it's a low to moderate income home. Member Vasquez stated that's what it feels like it's handed over to the city and now we're responsible for it. Mr. Benoit stated but the city has already agreed to this. Ms. Smith stated yes the city agreed by having the guidelines that they are going to purchase them. Now if we cannot clear it environmentally, which is part of the historical discussion then that doesn't meet the requirements. The problem you run into if the city wants to say homeowner that lives on N 3rd Street we don't want to demolish this home because we think that it could be used for some other purpose down the road and then you have 3 other homes that are demolished and you've treated this person differently then the other 3 and I would say you better have a pretty good reason for it. It's affordable housing laws and everything. Chairman Manning stated my only concern with that though is that if the city is not involved with the acquisition and there may be planned ventures or programs that may be coming. Ms. Smith stated the city still signs the deed. It's not just blind. All of this information is signed by the city and it is sent for review. Chairman Manning stated so what I'm working with is if the city is working on a long range project and they're looking at potentially an acquisition of this neighborhood to build a new water treatment plant or something and then you all are making these acquisitions along the way. So, at some point with the city goes to sign the deeds and they see this and say woah not this one because this is part of a long range project for us. Ms. Smith stated so this is a new program for HUD and in the past it's been the General Land

Office who's been running the show. After Hurricane Ike that's who you saw down in the Crystal Beach/Galveston area was the GLO making the offers and a lot of that was dependent upon the line of vegetation and where that was determined. So, you took a gamble. You took a buyout depending on which side of the transaction you were on. That's one of the reasons why for this program they gave us local control so that there was that ability. Member Vasquez stated so this is for 4 structures. It's not an ongoing thing? Ms. Smith stated so we started off with around 22 applications. A lot of people withdrew because they were able to sell their home privately faster a lot of them said I want to participate that's fine but I'm also putting it on the market. Like I said this is not the easy way out. This is a lot of hoops to jump through, a lot of red tape. Some people could not find housing that they could afford once they saw the fair market value. This is the remaining 4 after everyone else has withdrawn voluntarily or denied. We only had a couple who were denied and those were because of having difficulty proving homeownership. This program is no longer taking applications. There are other programs that the city of Orange does have underway and has been approved and is in the final stages of moving through FEMA request for information stages. We have 2 programs. One acquisition and one elevation program. Some of those are overlapping where if the homeowners can get approved for the elevation, they said they would prefer to do that but in the absence of that would be willing to participate in the buyout. Chairman Manning stated so this is not a program from now until forever. Ms. Smith stated no and those other programs, those applications have already been taken as well. Those are closed. Interest in these programs with the housing market being like it is, is dwindling.

Member Trawhon stated what happens if we were to determine this house had historical significance. What happens then? Ms. Smith stated it would still be taken to council and it would be their decision ultimately. Even if Texas Historical Commission had said we found this home to have historical significance and demolishing it is an adverse effect. When that happens, it is up to the city to determine how or even if to move forward. But that only happens when you use federal funds. If someone to purchase this property outright. They wouldn't be sitting here asking you if they could demolish it. They could go in and do whatever they wanted with it. Chairman Manning stated well they would if it was in the historic district. Mr. Benoit stated they would have to come to us to get permits. Chairman Manning stated so the question to us is, is that a historic structure. Ms. Smith stated and the other option you have as a city is to have a discussion about what you can do to preserve whether it's taking pictures or whatever.

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

Consider and possible action on a finding of no historic significance for a structure located at 903 N. 3rd Street as part of the Orange County Housing Buyout Program

Member Wheeler stated I guess you all have deemed it uninhabitable. Mr. Benoit stated I've never looked at that structure. This is the first I've ever heard of it. Member Wheeler stated how was it deemed uninhabitable. Mr. Knauf stated the owner had deemed that they have no interest in repairing it from the flood. They have verified to the program that they have no interest in repairing it. Ms. Smith stated correct and technically to be eligible for the program you could have made the repairs and we would still be able to purchase it from you. Just this one has not had repairs. Mr. Knauf stated but it has not gone through code enforcement at this point.

Councilmember Childs stated Marvin didn't you state it's not a residence. It looks commercial. Mr. Benoit stated yes it look commercial. I'd have to look on the appraisal district on how they classified it. Ms. Smith stated let me see if I have that. Councilmember Childs stated with no 3x4 windows in there, it can't be a residence. Mr. Benoit stated no it wouldn't meet the requirements. If they would have ever wanted to rebuild it, they would have had to cut out some windows. I guess in my mind it's not cost effective because we could probably tear that down for \$3000. The owner retains the rights to the property so the city may have to cut it but the city is not liable for it and they could sell the property and we could rebuild on it meeting the height requirements for elevation to rebuild that piece of parcel.

Chairman Manning stated I get that we can give our opinion on whether or not we think there is any historical significance. I get that they're in the program and they've met the requirements but what if this is not even zoned a residential property. I think the city would have to have discussions on the program. Can we forward a motion saying we find no historical significance but would like to send that to the council for consideration based on the questions that have come up here. Councilmember Childs stated so you want to put back on us to determine if it's a residence. Chairman Manning stated no does it fit the program that you all signed up for. She's saying it does. Councilmember Childs stated it doesn't have to be a residence. Chairman Manning stated that's what I'm saying that is out of our prevue to determine if that is accurately in the program. Ms. Smith stated on whether or not it met the code to be considered a residence is not necessarily something that the program addresses if the homeowner says that it is and it is zoned residential. I can check into it. Councilmember Childs stated that blows my mind with Marvin and then the past inspector was here what 30 years and that was ever deemed a residence. I mean Tom would have said the same thing he did, no egress. But you're saying it's zoned residential. Mr. Knauf stated yes. Ms. Smith stated and that may be why this homeowner thinks they can't sell it. There may be all kinds of reasons.

Member Wheeler motioned to approve finding no historic significance

Member Vasquez 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish the structure at 903 N. 3rd Street

Member Vasquez motioned to table

Member Wheeler 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish Building B-1 including apartments 509 through 529 at 605 1st Street

Mr. Knauf stated these are the Sabine Park Apartments that have significant problems. They've got water leaks, sewer leaks that are baking up on the property, mold in the buildings, broken windows, roof damage, vagrants, insects, snakes and the owner lives in Brooklyn, New York and has not really cooperated at all except very, very little with us in trying to resolve this situation. The owner actually has problems similar to this in other states. So, this went before the hearing officer and the owner was given an opportunity to have a representative there. They chose not to. There was nobody representing the owner at the hearing and so the city put on its case. The hearing officer ordered the buildings to be demolished, all 9 of them and ordered any occupants of these buildings to be evacuated. Member Vasquez stated were they full of occupants. Mr. Knauf stated no. There were 2. One was in the process of moving and one wasn't. Member Vasquez stated not that they should live there. I just don't want anybody to be homeless. Mr. Knauf stated this is part of a larger complex. This is 1 block out of like 5 blocks including the administrative office. It's located in the Old Orange historic district. These properties were actually built in 1941. They were remodeled in the 2000's sometime. Chairman Manning stated they were part of the naval housing barracks. Member Vasquez stated so the city has taken ownership of the property. Mr. Knauf stated no he still owns it. Member Vasquez stated is he paying his taxes. Mr. Knauf stated no. He has not paid his current taxes. He is delinquent in his current taxes. Also, he is delinquent in his utility payments to the city significantly.

Member Wheeler stated can the city put a lien on it for the demo. Mr. Knauf stated yes. Member Wheeler stated it doesn't have to be an interest growing lien but at least a lien because I think there's people that would like to invest on that property for development in the near future. Mr. Knauf stated yes we would especially something this magnitude, this size we would most likely put a lien on to recoup our costs. Whenever the city demolishes property, we do not take title to the property. The title to the property still belongs with the property owner. All we're doing is abating a nuisance. We are not acquiring property. Even if they build, then they owe the lien and there's interest that builds up on the lien and they have to pay that before the property can be sold. Now sometimes there's private sales without doing a title search or lien search and you or I have just inherited a lien from you. If you go through a title company that lien would have been extinguished at closing before you could close. Member Wheeler stated I would motioned to approve demo with the city to look into putting lien on property. Mr. Knauf stated that's a city hall decision. Chairman Manning stated our task is to approve appropriateness for demolition and there has never been anything more appropriate. I don't know if we can add anything to it but I would personally attend city council meeting to recommend that. Also there has been a lot of crime in that area, actual murders in that area and if we can do anything to improve the livability in Orange. I would be willing to attend a council meeting with my fellow members to recommend putting liens on property. Mr. Knauf stated if you have a quorum of the commission we have to post it as a meeting otherwise you're in violation of the open meetings act. Councilmember Childs stated historical property and we take it down, it is going to stay within the historic realms that it has to be redeveloped to some historical nature, correct? Mr. Knauf stated yes. Member Wheeler stated is that already deemed commercial. Mr. Knauf stated its C-2 which allows apartment complexes but mostly commercial like convenience stores, grocery stores, etc.

Member Wheeler motioned to approve

Member Trawhon 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish Building B-2 including apartments 531 and 533 at 605 1st Street

Member Vasquez motioned to approve

Member Trawhon 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish Building B-3 including apartments 534 through 548 at 605 1st Street

Member Trawhon motioned to approve

Member Vasquez 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish Building B-4 including apartments 550 through 564 at 605 1st Street

Member Trawhon motioned to approve

Member Vasquez 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish Building B-5 including apartments 535 through 553 at 605 1st Street

Member Wheeler motioned to approve

Member Trawhon 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish Building B-6, Apartments 555 through 569 at 605 1st Street

Member Vasquez motioned to approve

Member Trawhon 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish Building B-7 including apartments 502 and 504 at 605 1st Street

Member Trawhon motioned to approve

Member Wheeler 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish Building B-8 including apartments 506-520 at 605 1st Street

Member Wheeler motioned to approve

Member Vasquez 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish Building B-9 including apartments 522 and 524 at 605 1st Street

Member Vasquez motioned to approve

Member Trawhon 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carries

Consider and possible action on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the City of Orange to demolish the primary structure at 510 3rd Street

Mr. Knauf stated this is the old Orange Villa assisted living center. This property again has also been submitted for a substandard hearing and the hearing officer considered the city's case and found that this is a substandard building and ordered it demolished.

Member Trawhon stated this wasn't the old Lutch Hospital was it? Chairman Manning stated it was a rest home. Mr. Knauf stated it was a rest home or assisted living. Member Vasquez stated it's just that building could have been repurposed but I guess it's just empty too long. Mr. Knauf stated yes and we've found vagrants living in it. Chairman Manning stated and again the cost to demolish that must be astronomical. Does it have asbestos and all that? Mr. Knauf stated we would have to do an asbestos study and everything. Member Vasquez stated when was it built. Mr. Knauf stated I really don't know.

Member Wheeler motioned to approve

Member Trawhon 2nd

Vote: 4 – 0

Motion Carrie

Chairman Manning adjourned the meeting at 7:12 p.m.