



## TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

### REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, September 27, 2022, 4:30 P.M.

City Hall @ One Technology Center, 175 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
10th Floor, South Conference Room

#### A. Opening Matters

##### 1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum

Commissioner Turner called the Regular Meeting to order at 4:34 P.M.

##### **Members Present**

James Turner, AIA, Chair  
Chris Bumgarner  
Royce Ellington\*  
Geoff Evans, PLA, ASLA  
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS  
Susan McKee, MFA  
Ted A. Reeds II, AIA  
Mark Sanders  
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.

##### **Members Absent**

Holly Becker, Vice-Chair  
Katelyn Parker, RA, Secretary

##### **Staff Present**

Felicity Good, Robi Jones, Audrey Blank\*

##### **Others Present**

John Spillyards, Don Robertson, Freida Robertson, Craig Holman, Barbara Olson

\*Late Arrival

##### 2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 8, 2022

Staff announced that the minutes will be available at the meeting on October 13, 2022.

##### 3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

None

#### B. Actionable Items

##### 1. **HP-0389-2022 / 1546 S. Yorktown Pl.** (Gillette)

Applicant: Darwin Olson

Proposal:

1. Construction of porch on east side of residence

Staff directed commissioners' attention to Section 70.070-F of the Tulsa Zoning Code and afterwards presented its report, noting that the house is particularly significant to

the district because it was the Tulsa World's Model Home of the Year in 1923. Commissioner Turner reported that he was present at the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee when the application was reviewed on September 20, 2022. He had a split feeling about the construction of the porch because the house was a great example of the Tudor Revival style and he hated to see anything happen to the front of the house. He had encouraged the applicant to see if she could find any examples of other Tudor Revival houses with similar porches. He stated that the subcommittee discussed the bricks and found that wire faced bricks in three (3) or four (4) colors were present. He reported that the applicant had constructed an addition at the rear of the house several years ago and the bricks matched up very well. The homeowner, Barbara Olson, was present and reported that their contractor could find almost all the brick colors and could source the missing colors from the rear of the detached garage because it has the original brick on it. Commissioner Sanders asked if that was for all the colors and Ms. Olson stated that it was for whatever colors were needed. Commissioner Townsend asked the applicant if the drawing was off center due to a scanning issue and the applicant answered affirmatively. Commissioner Turner added that there was a slight swoop of the roofline on the drawing of the porch, which is normal with Tudor Revivals. Commissioner Sanders stated that he was very concerned about matching the brick. He said he could support the new porch but only if all the brick is taken off the rear of the garage and reused on the porch without the addition of new brick. Commissioner Grant noted that he was not too concerned about the brick, but he was concerned about the color of the mortar because if the color of the mortar is off, it could destroy the whole look. Ms. Olson assured him that the mortar on the addition matches the rest of the house and would be the same on the porch. Commissioner Grant asked about the placement of the steps and lion statues, and Ms. Olson replied that they would remain in their current location. Commissioner Grant then asked about the depth of the porch, and Commissioner Turner clarified that it would match the depth of the existing patio. Commissioner Turner recalled that the subcommittee had briefly discussed the fact that the sides of the porch, if original to the house, would have probably had arches to match the front of the porch, but constructing those features now would disturb the masonry on the east façade of the house. Commissioner Reeds said he understood Commissioner Turner's concern about the purity of the style, but he felt like the proposed porch with the open walls and the type of arch it has would be beautiful and liked the simple idea of it. Commissioner Sanders pointed out that the brick detail in the existing gable would be lost, and Commissioner Turner noted that the detail would be replicated with the opening in the porch gable. Commissioner Evans agreed with Commissioner Reeds and stated that the porch would add to the character of the porch on the south and the rest of the house. Commissioner Turner observed that new concrete would be poured and asked if the pink-tinted concrete pattern on the existing porch would be matched, and Ms. Olson replied that it would. Commissioner Grant asked the applicant if they were keeping the light fixtures, and Ms. Olson answered affirmatively.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Evans made a motion to approve the application with the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee's recommendations as conditions of approval. Commissioner Turner, along with Staff, outlined those conditions:

- that the roof line match the existing gable roof,
- that the trim match the existing trim,
- that the opening in the gable contain no window,
- that the porch floor be replaced with similarly tinted concrete in a matching pattern as the existing,
- that the bricks on the rear of the garage be reused for the porch addition,

- and that the mortar match the existing mortar.

Commissioner Sanders asked if that meant that they were denying the use of new brick or just stating that the colors of brick that the contractor could not find would be sourced from the back of the garage. Ms. Olson stated that her contractor was able to find some of the brick colors and would use the colors he could not find from the existing brick on the rear of the garage. Commissioner Sanders stated that as long as the contractor was removing bricks, he should source all the bricks from the back of the garage. Commissioner Turner clarified that they were making the motion to reuse the bricks off the back of the garage. Commissioner McKee asked if the existing house number would be transferred to the new construction. The Commissioners felt like it was an important aspect and the motion was revised to add the following condition:

- that the existing house numbers be moved to or replicated in the new gable.

Commissioner Townsend asked for clarification about reusing the brick from the back of the garage. She stated that they wanted the minimal amount of new brick as necessary, and that they did not want new bricks with a few pieces from the garage but rather wanted them to use as many old bricks as possible. Commissioner Turner restated that they were making a motion for approval with the condition of reusing the existing brick off the garage with the assumption that they will have all the colors available to make it work. He explained that if that was not the case, the applicant could come back with a new proposal. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, B.1.1, B.1.2, B.1.3, B.1.4, B.2.1, B.2.2, B.2.3, B.2.4, B.2.5, B.3.1, B.3.2, B.3.3, B.4.1, B.4.2, B.5.1, B.5.2, B.5.3

**Vote: 1546 S. Yorktown Pl. (Gillette)**

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

**2. HP-0392-2022 / 1528 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)**

Applicant: Ibtihal Rahima  
 Proposal: Construction of fence

Commissioner Turner suggested that Item 2 be moved to the end of the agenda since the applicant was not present. There was no objection.

**3. HP-0393-2022 / 1343 E. 20<sup>th</sup> St. (Swan Lake)**

Applicant: Alan Holcombe  
 Proposal:  
 1. Replacement of driveway

Staff presented its report, and a representative from the concrete company, Craig Holman, was present. Commissioner Turner asked him if he had anything to add to staff's report. Mr. Holman noted that the main focus of replacing the driveway was to remove the steps going up the middle because they are hazardous. He also mentioned that the narrow width of the driveway makes it difficult for the homeowner to navigate. He explained that they wanted to extend the west side of the driveway between fourteen inches (1'-2") and fifteen inches (1'-3") to the property line, add a four-inch (0'-4") ledge to help with water drainage, and remove the steps to make the driveway solid concrete. Commissioner Turner reported on the findings of the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee on September 20, 2022. After researching the homes on either side of the subject property through a Google search, the subcommittee felt like the design with steps in the middle of the driveway was supported by the neighborhood surroundings. The subcommittee also felt that the steps would be easier to navigate than the ramps on either side of them. Mr. Holman explained that the Google images were out of date because those driveways no longer had built-in steps. Commissioner Grant asked how the homeowner was going to get to the front door in the winter, and Mr. Holman explained that they would eventually put in stairs, but it was not part of this application. He added that the new driveway would have more traction and they would be removing the hump at the top of the driveway so it would not be quite as steep. Commissioner Ellington questioned how the new design would prevent the flow of water onto the site, and Mr. Holman replied that the curb on the west side of the driveway would help with water flow. Commissioner Sanders pointed out that the addition of fourteen inches (1'-2") or fifteen inches (1'-3") of concrete would ease the navigation of the driveway even with the stairs retained in the middle. Mr. Holman agreed that it might help some but their priority was eliminating the hazard of climbing the stairs. Commissioner Sanders replied that the presence of the stairs would simply give an option of climbing them and stated that he found the steps to be a character-defining feature of the site. Commissioner Evans observed that, based on Google, few if any driveways with steps remained on the street. Commissioner Grant stated that he was still concerned about erosion that could be caused by removing the slope to the west of the driveway, and Mr. Holman explained that the addition of the curb on the west side of the driveway would help water to flow down the driveway. Commissioner Turner asked how wide the driveway would be overall, and Mr. Holman stated it would be approximately nine feet (9'-0"). Commissioner Reeds stated that since there is a plan to add stairs at a later date, although he realized that the commission cannot hold the applicant to that addition, and because they discovered that no other property on the block had the same composition of driveway, the need for further discussion about the steps was eliminated. Commissioner Bumgarner added that the stairs could be considered a hazard and a hardship to the owner. Commissioner Reeds agreed and stated that the steps do not meet current building code requirements because there is no railing and they could be dangerous. Commissioner Reeds emphasized that, although he thought the steps were beautiful and a part of the fabric of the neighborhood, he felt that requiring the applicant to keep them would be the same as telling them to maintain a hazard that does not meet code. There was some discussion about whether or not the steps were a hazard, but most Commissioners agreed that they would not meet today's building code. Commissioner Ellington inquired about the plans for adjusting the grade to resolve the uneven slope of the driveway, and Mr. Holman explained that they would backfill the area and lay sod. Commissioner Turner asked if the portion of the driveway crossing the sidewalk would be flat, and Mr. Holman answered affirmatively.

As there was no more discussion, Commissioner Reeds made a motion to approve the replacement of the driveway as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and approved with a majority.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, G.2.1, G.2.2, G.2.3, G.2.4

**Vote: 1343 E. 20<sup>th</sup> St. (Swan Lake)**

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

**4. HP-0394-2022 / 1107 E. 21<sup>st</sup> St. (North Maple Ridge)**

Applicant: Ranchers Pipe & Steel

Proposal:

1. Installation of gate at driveway

Staff presented its report, noting that the applicant had submitted a revised drawing, and everyone had a copy in front of them. The homeowners, Freida and Don Robertson, were present to answer questions. Mr. Robertson added that they want to install a gate because they are concerned about safety. Commissioner Grant asked if the gate would be automatic, and Ms. Robertson stated that a solar-powered gate opener would be used to operate the gate and added that each gate panel crossing the driveway was nine feet (9'-0") wide. Commissioner Reeds wondered if there would be enough room for the gate to open and the cars to park. Mr. Robertson answered that there was plenty of room and they could park four (4) cars under the carport. Commissioner Sanders told the homeowners that he appreciated them placing the gate back from the sidewalk and that it was really graceful concept. Ms. Robertson stated the location of the gate leaves plenty of room for their guests to park in the driveway.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application for the installation of gate at driveway as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Townsend and 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, G.1.5

**Vote: 1107 E. 21<sup>st</sup> St. (North Maple Ridge)**

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Turner			Becker
2. Bumgarner			Parker
3. Ellington			

4. Evans
5. Grant
6. McKee
7. Reeds
8. Sanders
9. Townsend

**5. HP-0392-2022 / 1528 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)**

Applicant: Ibtihal Rahima

1. Proposal: Construction of fence

Staff presented its report, noting that the applicant was not able to attend the meeting. Commissioner Turner reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee found that the six-foot (6'-0") privacy fence was not appropriate to the neighborhood or supported by the zoning code. They recommended that the fence be shortened to four feet (4'-0") with the addition of a cap if it was not going to be a picket fence. Staff added that the zoning code only allows a maximum height of 4-feet for fences within the street setback and since the property is zoned RM-2, the street setback is ten feet (10'-0"). In response to a question from Commissioner Sanders, Staff also clarified that the City of Tulsa does not regulate which side of the fence faces which direction. Commissioner Sanders suggested removing the first two sections of the fence and shortening the height of the fence to four feet (4'-0") or making it a four-foot (4'-0") picket fence. Commissioner Grant asked for clarification about the subcommittee's recommendation, and Commissioner Turner replied that they had recommended that the height of the fence be reduced and a cap be added to match the cap on the gate. Commissioner Ellington stated that the privacy fence did not meet the requirements of the Unified Design Guidelines and referenced Guideline G.1.4. Commissioner Turner noted that wood as a fence material is supported by the neighborhood but that a picket fence would be a more appropriate design.

Commissioner Sanders made a motion to approve the application with the condition that three (3) sections of the fence closest to the street be removed and the remainder of the fence within the street yard be reduced to four feet (4'-0") in height. Commissioner Bumgarner could not recall any solid wood fences within street yards in the district. Commissioner Evans conceded that the explanation provided by the applicant of the presence of the neighbor's dog in the front yard created a unique situation that could justify the fence. Commissioner Sanders withdrew his motion and then made a motion to deny the application for the construction of the fence east of the gate. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, G.1.1, G.1.2, G.1.3, G.1.4, G.1.5

**Vote: 1528 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)**

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Turner			Becker
2. Bumgarner			Parker
3. Ellington			
4. Evans			
5. Grant			

6. McKee
7. Reeds
8. Sanders
9. Townsend

C. Reports

1. Staff Report

Staff reported that the Board of Adjustment reversed the decision of the Preservation Commission and approved the windows that had been installed at 308 West King Street.

Staff reported that the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Tracy Park Historic Preservation Overlay per the Preservation Commission's recommendation and that it would go to City Council in late October or early November.

Staff reported that the Owen Park Neighborhood Association had some interest in seeking an HP Overlay and had invited Ms. Good and Ms. Jones to speak at their next neighborhood meeting on Sunday, October 2, 2022.

Staff reported that the annual postcard notifications to owners within the existing HP Overlay districts had been sent out.

Staff reported on the success of the two recent workshops on house painting and window restoration.

2. Chair Report

None

D. New Business

None

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

None

F. Public Comment

None

G. Adjournment

Commissioner Turner adjourned the Regular Meeting at 5:50 P.M.