



# TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

## REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

**Thursday, August 10, 2023, 11:00 A.M.**

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

### A. Opening Matters

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

Commissioner Parker called the regular meeting to order at 11:01 A.M.

#### **Members Present**

Katelyn Parker, RA, Chair  
Royce Ellington, Secretary  
Chris Bumgarner  
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS  
Shane Hood  
Susan McKee, MFA  
James E. Turner, AIA

#### **Members Absent**

Mark D. G. Sanders, Vice-Chair  
Geoffery Evans, PLA, ASLA  
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.

#### **Staff Present**

Caroline Guerra Wolf, Felicity Good, Caleb Rocha, Skylar Marlow-Fuson

#### **Others Present**

Joseph Gilbert, Clay Holk, Amanda Riley, Liz Murry

#### 2. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

None

### B. Actionable Items

#### 1. **HP-0489-2023 / 1901 S. Norfolk Ave.** (North Maple Ridge)

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: None*

Applicant: Joseph Gilbert

Proposal:

##### 1. Construction of fence in street yard

*Project completed without an historic preservation permit*

Staff directed commissioners' attention to Section 70.070-F of the Tulsa Zoning Code and afterwards presented its report. The applicant, Joseph Gilbert, shared photographs of nearby properties with similar fences and stated that most surrounding houses on corner lots have fences within the street yard on the side of the house, including a property at 17<sup>th</sup> Place and Newport Avenue which had a matching fence. Mr. Gilbert explained he did not extend the fence across the entire north side of his house in order to respect the orientation of the other houses at the

intersection of 17<sup>th</sup> Place and Norfolk Avenue, which all faced 17<sup>th</sup> Place. Finally, Mr. Gilbert stated that the fence was installed to achieve a backyard area. Commissioner Parker requested clarification about the height of the fence, and Mr. Gilbert replied that the fence was approximately four feet (4'-0") tall and was taller at the back because it extended at a level height across the site. Mr. Gilbert stated that he planned to eventually regrade the yard so that the bottom of the fence would be straight but noted that he intended to plant vegetation along the fence. Commissioner Turner requested clarification about the location of the gate, and Mr. Gilbert explained that there was a gate across the driveway and another gate on the south side of the house outside the street yard.

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

**Vote: 1901 S. Norfolk Ave.** (North Maple Ridge)

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

2. **HP-0490-2023 / 1599 Swan Dr.** (Swan Lake)

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: None*

Applicant: Clay Holk

Proposal:

1. Replacement of fence in street yard

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Clay Holk, stated that some main fence posts were failing after the windstorm in June, so the entire fence had structural issues. Mr. Holk stated that, with the look and age of the fence in mind, he determined the best option would be to replace the fence and match the existing appearance. Mr. Holk stated he believed the fence was approximately forty (40) years old and noted that some of the wood along the fence had rotted. Finally, Mr. Holk explained that he proposed an eight-foot privacy fence because his property abuts Utica Avenue, so he would like to mitigate the noise and provide additional security. Commissioner Turner asked about the allowance of an eight-foot (8'-0") fence, and Felicity Good stated that the Board of Adjustment had approved a Special Exception for the eight-foot (8'-0") fence in the 1990s. Commissioner Turner asked if the owner was aware of any complaints about sight triangles or visibility along Utica Avenue, and Mr. Holk stated that visibility was achieved along Utica Avenue. Commissioner Parker stated that she had no issue with the proposal but agreed that the City may have an issue with the height of the fence along the street. Commissioner Grant found the seven-foot (7'-0") gates with the eight-foot (8'-0") tall fence to be odd. Mr. Holk stated that the site had an incline, so the gates were probably closer to six feet (6'-0") tall. Commissioner Grant asked if the applicant was willing to make the height of the gates even with the top of the fence, and Mr. Holk confirmed he could do so. Commissioner Parker noted that an eight-foot (8'-0") gate was not standard, so it may need to be custom made. Commissioner Hood pointed out that the gate may have to open in toward the yard so

that it does not swing out into the public sidewalk. Commissioner Turner asked for an explanation for the proposed height of the fence. Mr. Holk stated that he would like to maintain an eight-foot (8'-0") tall fence because of the road noise and that he would like to complete the project as soon as possible for safety for his dog and child. Mr. Holk added that Utica Avenue was a busy thoroughfare with a lot of foot traffic near the hospital. Commissioner McKee stated that she understood his reasoning.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Bumgarner made a motion to approve the application with the conditions that the top of each gate match the height of the fence and that the gates swing inward. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and passed with a majority.

**Vote: 1599 Swan Dr. (Swan Lake)**

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

3. **HP-0488-2023 / 1202 E. 18<sup>th</sup> St.** (North Maple Ridge)  
*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: None*

Applicant: Amanda Riley

Proposal:

1. Construction of masonry edging around planting beds

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Amanda Riley, estimated that the edging would be eight inches (0'-8") tall based on the thickness of the bricks on her house and anticipated that most of the edging would not be visible when the grass grew around it. Ms. Riley stated that, while doing landscaping in her yard, she found a few bricks that suggested some sort of edging had previously been present.

Commissioner Turner asked if she had considered creating square instead of rounded planting beds with the edging, and Ms. Riley replied that she had not because she intended to keep the same beds that were present already.

Commissioner Turner suggested squared or zig-zagged beds with concrete corners.

Ms. Riley conceded that she did not know how to treat the sharp corner on the existing bed at the east side of the front walkway, and Commissioner Turner suggested a cast concrete pier at that corner. Commissioner Parker agreed with the suggestion to make the beds square. Ms. Riley wondered if square, zig-zagged corners would cause a tripping hazard, so Commissioners Parker and Turner suggested bringing the corners out in one straight line. Commissioner Grant complimented the applicant on the front entryway of the house. Commissioner Parker asked how the applicant felt about the straightening the flower beds. Commissioner Hood stated that the change would address the sharp corner in the existing bed, and Commissioner Parker agreed that the existing sharp corner would be more of a tripping hazard than square beds. Ms. Riley noted that the fountain she had purchased was not yet set in place and added that she intended to straighten the sidewalk, install a fountain basin, and add a circular walkway around the basin. Ms. Riley stated that she had thought the edging would be an easily approved project.

Commissioner Turner asked how the existing brick piers and proposed edging would

relate to the sidewalk if it were straightened, and Ms. Riley stated that she thought she would center the sidewalk on the steps. Commissioner Turner suggested adding a wider landing in front of the steps, and Commissioner McKee stated that was a common feature in the neighborhood. Commissioner Grant stated that the applicant had provided a verbal description of the plans but that a site plan which clearly showed the proposal was needed. Commissioner Grant asked the applicant if she was willing to discuss the proposal with the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. Ms. Riley stated that she did not wish to relocate plants that she had just planted and asked if the request for square beds was just a personal preference. Commissioner Parker stated that square beds would be more appropriate for the style of the house and would address the concern about the tripping hazard of the existing bed and agreed with Commissioner Grant's suggestion to refer the application to the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. The applicant and commissioners then discussed the applicant's plans for the walkway. Commissioner Hood stated that a lot of smaller projects had been brought up and the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee could accomplish more by discussing them all at once. Ms. Riley asked if the application could be put on the subcommittee agenda the following Tuesday, and Felicity Good stated that she could accommodate the request and summarized the items discussed. Ms. Riley stated that she liked some of the suggestions made by the preservation commissioners.

4. **HP-0467-2023 / 1215 S. Newport Ave.** (Tracy Park)

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 3, 2023*

Applicant: Nguyen Win Properties

Proposals:

1. Replacement of front door
2. Replacement of soffit and fascia
3. Construction of rails
4. Application of limewash to masonry

*Project initiated without an historic preservation permit*

Staff presented its report. The applicant was not present. Commissioner Parker reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had decided to move the application forward despite the applicant's absence at the subcommittee meeting. Commissioner Parker reported that the subcommittee reviewed and made a recommendation for each item on its own. Commissioner Grant stated that the work completed on the house so far served as an example of why the historic preservation overlay is in effect, expressed sadness about the alterations to the house, and noted that the previous appearance of the house with original windows intact was stunning. Liz Murry, Neighborhood Representative for Tracy Park, stated that the owner did not intend to replace the last original window on the front façade because a wall had been installed behind it. Felicity Good recalled the owner stating that a wall was not present behind the window. Commissioner Bumgarner asked if the limewash, which had been applied to a portion of the north façade, could be removed. Commissioner Parker stated it was possible, but Commissioner Grant added that it would be very difficult to remove. Commissioner Parker clarified that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee's intent in recommending denial of the limewash was for the owner to remove what had been applied. Commissioner Turner wondered if dry blasting the wall would be the method for removal, and Commissioner Hood stated that chemical removal was preferable and would probably be possible. Commissioner Parker noted that the Unified Design Guidelines state that Staff can approve the removal of paint from brick surfaces. Commissioner Grant asked about the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee's recommendations, and Ms. Good summarized that the

subcommittee recommended denial of the replacement of the front door and application of limewash to masonry; recommended approval of the replacement of soffit and fascia with the conditions that the soffit be painted rather than stained and that the beading face down; and recommended approval of the construction of the rails. Upon a request for clarification from Commissioner Parker, Ms. Good confirmed that the previous proposal for installation of light fixtures had been withdrawn.

Commissioner Bumgarner suggested voting on each item separately. Commissioner Parker agreed and directed discussion to Item 1: Replacement of front door. Commissioner Turner made a motion to deny Item 1: Replacement of front door. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and passed unanimously.

**Vote: 1215 S. Newport Ave. (Tracy Park)**

Motion to deny Item 1: Replacement of front door

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

Commissioner Parker directed discussion to Item 2: Replacement of soffit and fascia. Commissioner Hood pointed out that the molding was no longer present along the eaves. Commissioner Bumgarner made a motion to deny Item 2: Replacement of soffit and fascia due to a lack of necessary information. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and passed unanimously.

**Vote: 1215 S. Newport Ave. (Tracy Park)**

Motion to deny Item 2: Replacement of soffit and fascia

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

Commissioner Parker directed discussion to Item 3: Construction of rails. Commissioner Hood expressed doubt about the appropriateness of the rail based on the limited information provided by the applicant. Commissioner Grant wondered whether the previous rail was original, and Commissioner McKee stated that it did not appear to be original in the photograph of the residence. Commissioner Parker noted the lack of details about the rail, and Commissioner Grant agreed that detailed drawings with dimensions were necessary. Commissioner Grant made a motion to deny Item 3: Construction of rails. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bumgarner and passed unanimously.

**Vote: 1215 S. Newport Ave. (Tracy Park)**  
Motion to deny Item 3: Construction of rails

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

Commissioner Parker directed discussion to Item 4: Application of limewash to masonry. Commissioner Bumgarner made a motion to deny Item 4: Application of limewash to masonry. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKee and passed unanimously. Commissioner Turner noted that he found the proposed rail on the manufacturer's website, and it appeared to be made of vinyl.

**Vote: 1215 S. Newport Ave. (Tracy Park)**  
Motion to deny Item 4. Application of limewash to masonry

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

5. **HP-0481-2023 / 1737 S. Zunis Ave. (Yorktown)**  
*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: None*  
Applicant: Roger L. Nelson  
Proposal:  
1. Removal of chimney

Staff presented its report, noting the vent chimney had been destroyed in the June windstorm and that the main chimney on the north side of the house would remain. The applicant was not present. As there was no discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and passed unanimously.

**Vote: 1737 S. Zunis Ave. (Yorktown)**

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

6. **HP-0489-2023 / 1121 E. 19<sup>th</sup> St.** (North Maple Ridge)  
*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: None*  
 Applicant: Oklahoma Natural Gas  
 Proposal:  
 1. Relocation of meter

Staff presented its report. The applicant was not present. As there was no discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker and passed with a majority.

**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	Hood		Sanders
2. Ellington			Evans
3. Bumgarner			Townsend
4. Grant			
5. McKee			
6. Turner			

C. Reports

1. Staff Report

Staff reported on staff-approved HP permits:

- a. **1737 S. Zunis Ave. (HP-0480-2023)**  
 Repair and replacement in-kind of damaged fascia, soffit, masonry on walls, and shake siding in gable
- b. **1710 S. Trenton Ave. (HP-0487-2023)**  
 Repair and replacement in-kind of damaged trim

2. Chair Report

None

D. New Business

Commissioner Grant noted that commissioner names and contact information were out of date on the preservation commission website. Felicity Good stated that she would check to be sure they were updated.

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

None

F. Public Comment

None

G. Adjournment

Commissioner Parker adjourned the regular meeting at 12:19 P.M.