



# TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

## REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

**Thursday, March 9, 2023, 11:00 A.M.**

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

### A. Opening Matters

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

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

#### **Members Present**

Katelyn Parker, RA, Chair  
Mark D. G. Sanders, Vice-Chair  
Royce Ellington, Secretary  
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS  
Susan McKee, MFA  
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.  
James Turner, AIA

#### **Members Absent**

Chris Bumgarner  
Geoffery Evans, PLA, ASLA

#### **Staff Present**

Felicity Good, Audrey Blank, Jeremy Banes

#### **Others Present**

Jake Landry, TJ Martin, Camaron Benjamin, Laven M. (?), John Spillyards

#### 2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, February 28, 2023

Staff noted that a draft of the minutes was not yet available but would be presented for review and approval at the next regular meeting on March 28.

#### 3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

Commissioner Parker disclosed that she had a conflict of interest as the architect for HP-0434-2023 at 1703 South Troost Avenue and that she would recuse herself during discussion and voting on that item.

### B. Actionable Items

#### 1. **HP-0433-2023 / 1121 E. 19<sup>th</sup> St.** (North Maple Ridge)

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: March 2, 2023*

Applicant: Clark Plost

Proposal:

1. Construction of fence and gate

*Project initiated without an historic preservation permit*

Staff directed commissioners' attention to Section 70.070-F of the Tulsa Zoning Code and afterwards presented its report, noting that the owner had responded promptly

with an Historic Preservation Permit application. The applicant's spouse, TJ Martin, added that the fence and gate were proposed due to security issues and that they did not realize an approval process would be required for the fence. Mr. Martin added that no work had been done since the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee meeting on March 2. Commissioner Sanders reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had found the applicant's justification for the fence to be sufficient and felt the fence was a well-designed, sensitive treatment. Commissioner Sanders explained that the columns would be painted to match the house, that the design of the gate echoed the design of a rail in the house, and that the house was a noncontributing structure built in the 1980s. Commissioner Ellington asked how the fence would connect at the side of the property, and Mr. Martin replied that a section of fence would be installed between the gate column and the existing brick wall along the property line with a short fence atop the brick wall. Commissioner Turner asked for clarification about the black square on the column in the recent photo of the house, and Mr. Martin stated it was a mailbox.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Townsend and passed unanimously.

**Vote: 1121 E. 19<sup>th</sup> St. (North Maple Ridge)**

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

2. **HP-0434-2023 / 1703 S. Troost Avenue. (Swan Lake)**

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: March 2, 2023*

Applicant: Jake Landry

Proposals:

1. Alteration of roof and dormer on east side of residence
2. Replacement of two (2) doors and one (1) window with one (1) window on dormer

Staff presented its report, noting that the applicant had provided drawings for three scenarios—the preferred Option 1 with one (1) window placed in the dormer, Option 2 with no windows in the dormer, and Option 3 with two (2) windows in the dormer. Commissioner Sanders gave the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee report, stating that all agreed to the requested adjustment of the roof but that the subcommittee members preferred the dormer to contain two windows echoing the dormer with a symmetrical row of windows on the front of the house. The applicant, Jake Landry, stated that placing two (2) windows on the center of the dormer would make it so that one (1) window would be asymmetrical on the interior space and partially inoperable, and the other window would be a faux window and entirely inoperable. Mr. Landry added that he did not believe the existing window and doors on the dormer were original to the house. Commissioner Townsend suggested using two (2) faux windows because it would not look strange inside and the exterior aesthetics would be better. Commissioner Turner suggested separating the two (2) windows, orienting the operable window on the interior space, and placing the other

window symmetrically in the dormer. Mr. Landry stated that Option 3 showed the windows mulled together to match the windows on the front dormer of the house. Commissioner Sanders asked whether the applicant objected to the concept of placing a second faux window in the south half of the dormer, and Mr. Landry replied that he did because the faux window would add a potential opening that water could infiltrate and would be isolated on the roof. Commissioner Grant stated that it would be unusual for a dormer to have no windows, that Commissioner Turner's recommendation would be functional from the inside while preserving the aesthetics from the outside, and that the preservation commission is primarily concerned with maintaining the exterior appearance of the house. Upon further inquiry from Commissioner Grant, Mr. Landry said the historical appearance of the dormer was not known as they were dealing with modifications made in perhaps the 1930s or 1940s and then described interior modifications made by the previous owner. Commissioner Sanders pointed out that the applicant already has a set of faux French doors and that the recommendations were to replace that with a faux window. Mr. Landry stated that the existing doors at some point had been functional, although they were not original to the house. Commissioner Ellington referenced section A.3 of the Unified Design Guidelines and stated that removing historic doors without installing something in their place would be a concern. Commissioner McKee agreed with the recommendation to add the second window. Mr. Landry noted that it would add significant cost to the project.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the application per the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee's recommendation, with the conditions that the dormer have two (2) windows, that the right (northern) window be centered in the interior space, and that the left (southern) window be symmetrical to it on the exterior of the dormer. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKee and passed with a majority.

**Vote: 1703 S. Troost Ave. (Swan Lake)**

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

\*Recused

**3. HP-0435-2023 / 1701 S. Newport Ave. (North Maple Ridge)**

Applicants: Connor & Madeleine Hasbrook

Proposals:

1. Construction of retaining wall
2. Construction of fence and gates

*Application to amend previous application denied by Tulsa Preservation Commission on February 28, 2023*

Staff presented its report, and the applicants were not present. Commissioners Grant and Ellington agreed that the application was much improved. Commissioner Parker expressed approval of the addition of a masonry cap along the wall and observed that

the placement of the piers was consistent with the example the applicant provided from the neighborhood.

Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Townsend. Commissioner Sanders stated that he felt Ameristar fences are often not historically appropriate because they are hollow and have a lot of visible hardware but supported the project because of the addition of columns similar to other examples in the neighborhood. Commissioner Parker called for a vote, and the motion passed with a majority.

**Vote: 1701 S. Newport Ave. (North Maple Ridge)**

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

**4. HP-0436-2023 / 1127 S. Norfolk Ave. (Tracy Park)**

Applicant: Camaron Benjamin

Proposal:

1. Installation of solar panels on north, east, and south sides of residence

Staff presented its report, noting that the application had been forwarded without a review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee because of the applicant's project schedule. The applicant, Camaron Benjamin, stated that the planning stage of the project had begun before Tracy Park was included in an Historic Preservation Overlay, but no work had been done yet. Commissioner Turner said that he felt that solar panels should be placed at the rear of the house regardless of its status as a contributing or non-contributing structure and stated that the panels would not be acceptable on the north and south sides of the roof. Commissioner Turner suggested the applicant have them reconfigured and placed on the south side of the east extension of the house and on the accessory building in the back yard. Commissioner Parker explained to the applicant that the panels should not be visible from the street and that the applicant would need an historic preservation permit because the work had not been initiated by the time the overlay had been adopted. Mr. Benjamin stated that he could explore options with the solar panel company. Commissioner Townsend stated that the project schedule may be delayed. Commissioner Grant agreed that the panels should not be placed on the front sides of the roof but would be acceptable at the rear of the house. Commissioner Sanders stated that he supports solar energy and hopes to encourage its use within the boundaries of the guidelines. Commissioner Sanders also noted that the preservation commission had previously approved a Tesla roof system, as the panels were integrated into the roof rather than mounted on top.

The applicant requested time to consult with his contractor and examine alternatives to the presented application. The application was postponed to a future regular meeting.

**5. Application – Funds for Certified Local Government Program, Fiscal Year 2023-2024**

Staff presented the draft application for the use of funds awarded to the City of Tulsa’s Certified Local Government Program. Commissioner Turner suggested using funds to print additional copies of the Unified Design Guidelines, and staff stated that could be accomplished if additional funds become available.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application for use of. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKee and passed unanimously.

**Vote: Application – Funds for Certified Local Government Program, Fiscal Year 2023-2024**

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

- C. Reports
  - 1. Staff Report  
None
  - 2. Chair Report  
None
- D. New Business  
None
- E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items  
None
- F. Public Comment  
None
- G. Adjournment  
Commissioner Parker adjourned the Regular Meeting at 12:07 P.M.