



TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, July 8, 2021, 11:00 A.M.

City Hall @ One Technology Center, 175 East 2nd Street
10th Floor - South Conference Room

A. Opening Matters

1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum

Commissioner Townsend called the Regular Meeting to order at 11:04 A.M.

Members Present

Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D., Chair
James E. Turner, AIA, Vice-Chair
Susan J. McKee, MFA, Secretary
Holly Becker*
Chris J. Bumgarner
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS
Katelyn C. Parker, RA
Mark D. G. Sanders*

Members Absent

Jillian Ihloff
Ted A. Reeds, II, AIA
Robert L. Shears, ASLA

Staff Present

Audrey D. Blank, Roy M. (Jed) Porter, Jr., Felicity Good

Others Present

Lesli E. Augsburg, Brandon L. Covey, W. C. Jones

*Late Arrival

2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, June 22, 2021

Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the Minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKee and approved with a majority.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, June 22, 2021

In Favor

1. Townsend
2. McKee
3. Grant
4. Parker
- 5.

Opposed

Abstaining

Turner
Bumgarner

Not Present

Becker
Ihloff
Reeds
Sanders
Shears

3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

Commissioner Turner disclosed that Brandon L. Covey, the applicant for HP-0286-2021, was his neighbor but noted that he had no financial interest in the project.

B. Public Information Session

1. Section 106 Process – Demolition – 1144 South Atlanta Avenue

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800, Staff presented information and invited public comment to address the determination of adverse effect of demolition on the residence located at 1144 South Atlanta Avenue. Staff explained that the property was considered a Contributing Resource in the Renaissance Neighborhood, which has been determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds administered by the Working in Neighborhoods Department would be used for the demolition of the residence. Commissioner Turner inquired about the ownership of the property, and staff replied that the property is privately owned. Commissioners then discussed possible means to leverage funds to acquire or rehabilitate, rather than demolish, the residence. Staff will pursue further inquiry with the Working in Neighborhoods Department and will attempt to engage with the owner. Staff noted that the adverse effect may be mitigated through documentation of the site and a survey of the Renaissance Neighborhood.

C. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0286-2021 / 1723 S. Rockford Ave.** (Swan Lake)

Applicant: Brandon L. Covey

Proposal:

1. Construction of rail on porch

Staff presented its report, and afterwards Commissioner Sanders reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had been impressed with the project and had recommended approval of the application. Commissioner Grant inquired about the height of the rail, and the applicant replied that the rail would be thirty inches (2'-6") in height to align with the bottom of the window sills and stated that the bottom rail would be one inch (0'-1") or one and one-half inch (0'-1½") above the floor of the porch. Commissioner Turner inquired whether the rail would extend past the columns, and the applicant answered affirmatively. Commissioner Grant requested clarification about the space between the balusters, and the applicant replied that there would be one and one-quarter inch (0'-1¼") or one and one-half inch (0'-1½") between each baluster. Commissioner Turner observed that the rail at 1706 South Rockford Avenue, which served as an example for the applicant, was not an original feature.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions—

- that the rail have an overall height of thirty inches (2'-6") and
- that the balusters and top rail match those in the photograph of the rail on the residence located at 1706 South Rockford Avenue.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bumgarner and was approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.6.5

Vote: 1723 S. Rockford Ave. (Swan Lake)

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend			Ihloff
2. Turner			Reeds
3. McKee			Shears
4. Becker			
5. Bumgarner			
6. Grant			
7. Parker			
8. Sanders			

2. **HP-0290-2021 / 1131 E. 18th St.** (North Maple Ridge)

Applicant: Lesli E. Augsburger

Proposal:

1. Construction of fence

Staff presented its report, noting that the existing metal fence was not original. Commissioner Sanders noted that the fence had already been constructed and reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had preferred the metal fence but found the fence to be well executed. The applicant shared photographs of the fence and added that it would be capped and trimmed to conceal the posts from every angle. Commissioner Turner inquired about the height of the fence, and the applicant indicated that it would be the same height as the existing metal fence and that the masonry wall and columns would be retained. Commissioner Grant inquired whether the fence on the north side of the site would be replaced, and the applicant stated that a new fence had been constructed. Commissioner Grant then inquired whether the applicant had considered vegetation rather than construction of a fence, and the applicant responded that she preferred an immediate solution to provide privacy but added that vegetation would be planted elsewhere. Upon a request for clarification from Commissioner Grant, the applicant stated that she had not been aware of the requirement for an Historic Preservation Permit when the fence was constructed. Commissioner Bumgarner suggested planting vegetation, such as ivy or shrubs, between the fence and the sidewalk, and the applicant accepted the proposal.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bumgarner and was approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4, G.1.1, G.1.2, G.1.3, G.1.4

Vote: 1131 E. 18th St. (North Maple Ridge)

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend			Ihloff
2. Turner			Reeds
3. McKee			Shears
4. Becker			
5. Bumgarner			
6. Grant			
7. Parker			
8. Sanders			

3. HP-0287-2021 / 305 E. 20th St. (North Maple Ridge)

Applicant: W.C. Jones

Proposals:

1. Removal of awning above entry*
2. Installation of fixture above entry*
3. Modification of design of gate for driveway*
4. Installation of fence*
5. Modification of design of fence on east side of residence*
6. Extension of period of performance

*Alteration of Approved Proposal

Staff presented its report, describing each modification of the Approved Proposal and noting that extension of the Period of Performance would allow the applicant to complete the project. Commissioner Sanders described each item, reporting that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had considered each item separately and, although there was not unanimous agreement on Item 2: Installation of fixture above entry, had recommended approval of each item. The applicant noted that the shutters may be manufactured from metal rather than wood, and Commissioner Townsend noted that the alteration of materials would require approval by the Tulsa Preservation Commission. Commissioner Turner observed that the alteration of features, such as the design of the gate and removal of the awning, changed the style of the residence from Art Nouveau, which had been an important topic of discussion during the review of the original proposal for the construction of the residence. Commissioner Parker agreed and noticed that several details, such as the window trim, had been lost between the approval of the proposal and the residence as constructed, resulting in a modern appearance. Commissioner Sanders compared the residence's style to Modern and International Styles and expressed a preference for the altered version. Commissioner Turner inquired about the pitch of the roof, and Commissioner Parker stated that the perspective of the drawing made the roof line appear different. The applicant noted that the height of the chimneys had been reduced to meet requirements from the Permit Center but that the windows had been constructed as they were approved and added that the appearance of the residence would change when the shutters were installed. Commissioner Turner inquired whether vegetation would be planted in front of the retaining wall, and the applicant stated that vegetation had already been planted. Commissioner Grant inquired about the height of the retaining wall and the metal fence, and the applicant stated that the wall is six feet (6'-0") in height and the iron fence is an additional forty-two inches (3'-6") in height. Commissioner Parker expressed distaste for the fixture above the entry but noted that installation of black shutters would improve the appearance. Commissioner Townsend agreed. Commissioner Bumgarner noted that the residence was a Non-Contributing Resource, expressed the opinion that these alterations did not detract from the

character of the district, and added that constructing a residence to match an artistic rendering is a difficult task. Commissioner Turner emphasized that the features that had been modified were all points of discussion during the review of the original application for the construction of the residence. Commissioner Parker repeated that the appearance of the fixture would improve once the shutters were installed, and Commissioner Turner agreed and commented that the awning would have been preferable. Commissioner Becker expressed distaste for the fixture but observed that it is a removable feature and could be easily removed. Commissioner Townsend complimented the owner on the residence and expressed approval of the application overall. Commissioner Bumgarner stated that he felt the fixture detracts from the appearance of the residence but not the character of the neighborhood. Commissioner McKee agreed that, although the fixture was not preferred, the shutters would improve its appearance.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Becker made a motion to approve the following items—

- Item 1: Removal of awning above entry,
- Item 3: Modification of design of gate for driveway,
- Item 4: Installation of fence,
- Item 5: Modification of design of fence on east side of residence, and
- Item 6: Extension of period of performance.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bumgarner and approved with a majority.

Guidelines cited: C.1.1, C.1.2, C.1.3, C.1.4, C.1.5, C.1.6, C.2.1, C.2.2, C.2.3, C.2.4, C.2.5, C.2.6, C.3.1, C.4.1, C.4.2, C.4.3, C.4.4, C.5.1, C.5.2, C.5.3, C.5.4, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4

Vote: 305 E. 20th Street. **(North Maple Ridge)**

- Item 1: Removal of awning above entry
- Item 3: Modification of design of gate for driveway
- Item 4: Installation of fence
- Item 5: Modification of design of fence on east side of residence
- Item 6: Extension of period of performance

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend	Turner		Ihloff
2. Becker	McKee		Reeds
3. Bumgarner			Shears
4. Grant			
5. Parker			
6. Sanders			

Commissioner Townsend then directed discussion to Item 2: Installation of fixture above entry. Staff noted that the residence was a Non-Contributing Resource and directed the Tulsa Preservation Commission to consider Section E of the Unified Design Guidelines. Commissioner Turner observed that the fixture was a removable feature. As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve Item 2: Installation of fixture above entry. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker and was approved with a majority.

Guidelines cited: C.1.1, C.1.2, C.1.3, C.1.4, C.1.5, C.1.6, C.2.1, C.2.2, C.2.3, C.2.4, C.2.5, C.2.6, C.3.1, C.4.1, C.4.2, C.4.3, C.4.4, C.5.1, C.5.2, C.5.3, C.5.4, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4

Vote: 305 E. 20th Street. **(North Maple Ridge)**
Item 2: Installation of fixture above entry

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend	Sanders		Ihloff
2. Turner			Reeds
3. McKee			Shears
4. Becker			
5. Bumgarner			
6. Grant			
7. Parker			

- D. Discussion – Robert’s Rules of Order
Commissioner Townsend noted that a suggestion was made at the Annual Retreat that the Tulsa Preservation Commission should follow Robert’s Rules of Order during its meetings. Commissioner Townsend indicated a preference for the Tulsa Preservation Commission’s order of discussion and emphasized the importance of allowing applicants to be heard before a motion was made on their application. Commissioners Turner and Bumgarner agreed.
- E. Reports
1. Chair Report
Commissioner Townsend requested that commissioners note any recommended revisions of the Unified Design Guidelines. Commissioner Townsend then inquired whether the Tulsa Foundation for Architecture would be an appropriate vehicle for acquisition of properties, and Commissioner Turner stated that the foundation could be an advocate for sites but would not have funds to acquire properties.
2. Staff Report
None
- F. New Business
Commissioner Turner inquired about Parking Passes. Staff will circulate a Parking Pass before the Tulsa Preservation Commission’s next Regular Meeting.
- G. Announcements and Future Agenda Items
None
- H. Public Comment
None
- I. Adjournment
Commissioner Townsend adjourned the Regular Meeting at 12:25 P.M.