



TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, August 22, 2023, 4:30 P.M.

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

A. Opening Matters

1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum

Commissioner Parker called the regular meeting to order at 4:31 P.M.

Members Present

Katelyn Parker, RA, Chair
Mark D. G. Sanders, Vice-Chair
Royce Ellington, Secretary
Chris Bumgarner
Geoffery Evans, PLA, ASLA
Peter Grant, GMR, CAPS
Shane Hood
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.
James E. Turner, AIA*

Members Absent

Susan McKee, MFA

Staff Present

Caroline Guerra Wolf, Felicity Good

Others Present

Karen Wilson, Amanda Riley

*Early departure

2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, July 13, 2023

Commissioner Townsend made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting on July 13, 2023. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and passed with a majority.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, July 13, 2023

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

3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
None

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0482-2023 / 1580 Swan Dr.** (Swan Lake)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 15, 2023

Applicant: Karen Wilson

Proposal:

1. Replacement of steps, retaining wall, walkway, and landing in street yard

Staff directed commissioners' attention to Section 70.070-F of the Tulsa Zoning Code and afterwards presented its report. Commissioner Evans reported that the Historic Preservation (HP) Permit Subcommittee discussed the application and clarified the materials to be used. Commissioner Evans explained that the subcommittee felt the project would be a good fit because the brick portion of the wall would match the house to give the appearance that the planting beds were extending from the existing house, and the use of stone closer to the street would tie into the existing retaining wall along the driveway. Commissioner Evans added that the plans were designed by a licensed landscape architect. The applicant, Karen Wilson, stated that she planned to return the steps near the front door to their previous rounded appearance and stated that the project would make the steps and landings safer, as it was difficult to walk across them in their current condition. Ms. Wilson stated that she planned to return with a proposal for a wrought iron railing along the south side of the walkway. Commissioner Sanders recalled that the HP Permit Subcommittee thought the project was appropriate, but, because the house was constructed outside the Swan Lake Historic District's period of significance, they did not severely review it for historical appropriateness. Commissioner Parker agreed that, as described in the Unified Design Guidelines, the design matched the house's style and period of construction. Commissioner Evans felt that the project would clean up the front yard and make it more streamlined. Ms. Wilson stated that her intent was for the elements to look as old as the house and to be a subtle change.

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

Vote: 1580 Swan Dr. (Swan Lake)

In Favor

1. Parker
2. Sanders
3. Ellington
4. Bumgarner
5. Evans
6. Grant
7. Hood
8. Townsend
9. Turner

Opposed

Abstaining

Not Present

McKee

2. **HP-0488-2023 / 1202 E. 18th St.** (North Maple Ridge)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 15, 2023

Applicant: Amanda Riley

Proposals:

1. Expansion of walkway in street yard
2. Installation of fountain basin in street yard
3. Construction of masonry edging around planting beds
4. Construction of rail and columns around porch

Staff presented its report. Ms. Riley shared samples of the proposed blend of salvaged bricks, which she found in Okmulgee, Oklahoma. Ms. Riley stated that any colors which were slightly off would be used for the bottom row of the edging. Commissioner Parker stated that the sample of bricks was spot-on and an amazing match to the bricks on the house. Commissioner Townsend asked the applicant how she was able to source the bricks, and Ms. Riley stated that she found them on an online marketplace. Commissioner Sanders reported that the HP Permit Subcommittee loved the integration of older materials, including the vintage fountain, and approved of the squared edging and the porch rail, which matched rails on other homes in the neighborhood. Commissioner Sanders stated that he saw the bricks in person and thought they had been taken from the rear of the residence because they matched so well. Ms. Riley stated that some bricks still had mortar attached so she would clean them before using. Finally, Commissioner Sanders reported that the subcommittee was excited about the project and recommended approval of the application. Commissioner Parker complimented the applicant's drawings. Ms. Riley stated that her husband was concerned that modern railings were required to be thirty-six inches (3'-0") tall but noted that a house across the street featured a rail nineteen inches (1'-7") tall. Ms. Riley explained that she planned for the rail to be between nineteen inches (1'-7") and twenty-nine inches (2'-5") tall with a limestone cap atop the brick piers. In response to a question from Commissioner Grant, Commissioner Parker estimated that the top rail would be just over twenty-five inches (2'-1") tall based on the drawing and mock-up of the brick piers. Commissioner Grant stated that the rail could be less than thirty-six inches (3'-0") tall if the porch floor was less than thirty inches (2'-6") above grade. Commissioner Grant then asked about the material of the rail, and Ms. Riley stated that the balusters would be constructed from wood with a 2 X 6 wood top cap sanded to be slightly sloped and that the cap on the brick piers would be limestone. Commissioner Turner asked if the proportions of the rail would closely match the nearby example rail in the photo provided by the applicant, and Ms. Riley confirmed that it would and stated that the balusters would be whittled from 4 X 4 boards. Commissioner Parker noted that the top rail might be a solid, carved piece of wood and the balusters would be placed into it. Commissioner

Grant asked if the top of the top rail would fall below the stone cap on the brick piers, and Ms. Riley answered affirmatively. Commissioner Turner advised the applicant that fiberglass balusters in the selected style might also be available. Commissioner Turner asked how much edging would be exposed, and Ms. Riley indicated it would be approximately eight inches (0'-8") tall. Commissioner Evans noted the edging would have two (2) courses of bricks and a third top course as a cap. Commissioner Turner asked about the treatment of the corners of the edging, and Ms. Riley stated that they would probably be squared with bricks. Commissioner Turner asked if the existing stairs and bulkheads would remain, and Ms. Riley stated they would remain for the time being. Commissioner Turner then asked if the fountain in the existing yard would sit inside the basin, and Ms. Riley replied that it would and added that the basin was necessary because the fountain leaked.

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

Vote: 1202 E. 18th St. (North Maple Ridge)

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

3. **HP-0484-2023 / 12 W. Latimer St. (Brady Heights/The Heights)**
Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 15, 2023

Applicant: Mallory Massey

Proposals:

1. Removal of door on north façade
2. Replacement of two (2) windows with two (2) doors on north façade
3. Replacement of cedar lap siding with novelty siding above stem wall on north facade
4. Replacement of lattice with wood skirting around porch

Project completed without an historic preservation permit

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Mallory Massey, was not present. Commissioner Sanders reported that the HP Permit Subcommittee made their recommendation on Item 2 with the condition that information about the material of the door be provided and asked staff if it had been. Ms. Good stated that she had passed along the request but had not received additional information about the door. Commissioner Sanders stated that those present during the subcommittee meeting agreed that a porch with a concrete or masonry foundation of some sort would have originally been present on the front of the house instead of the deck, which was an existing condition at the time the HP Overlay was adopted. Commissioner Sanders stated that, although the existing skirting was not beautiful, the subcommittee found it superior to lattice because the debris under the porch was not visible through the skirting. Commissioner Sanders stated that the subcommittee recommended denial of

Item 3 because the wider cedar siding below the water table was still present on the sides, and the subcommittee felt that the original look should be replicated on the front of the house. Commissioner Townsend observed the sliding glass door on the west side of the house, and Commissioner Parker stated that a French door had been present as recently as 2017. Commissioner Evans stated that at some point a previous owner had converted the duplex into a single-family house and the current owner had converted the building back into a duplex. Commissioner Parker recalled that the previous owner had applied for an HP Permit to convert the duplex into a single-unit house, and the permit had been approved by default due to some error or lapse in the review period. Commissioner Parker asked if the windows had been replaced by the current owner, but Ms. Good stated she believed the windows on the sides had not changed. Commissioner Evans noted the metal bars over the windows had been removed. Commissioner Sanders stated that, with the tortured history of the alterations to the building in mind, he felt that returning the building to its original configuration as a duplex was a major upgrade and made the house more historical and aesthetically balanced. Commissioner Townsend asked if the cedar siding beneath the water table was present behind the novelty siding, and Commissioner Sanders stated he hoped it was. Commissioner Parker stated that it appeared cedar siding had been present previously, and Ms. Good stated that it had been present as of 2014. Commissioner Hood asked if a comprehensive list of Work completed by the applicant was available. Ms. Good stated that she had compiled a list of Work she had observed, and the owner had confirmed that the items could be placed on the agenda. Commissioner Sanders clarified that the preservation commission could only act on the items listed on the agenda. Commissioner Parker asked if the commission could review additional Work that had also been completed. Ms. Good stated that she could forward those items to the applicant and ask for a subsequent application but that the commission should act only on the items listed on the current agenda. Commissioner Parker noted that the sliding glass door on the west side was new, and a French door had previously been present. Commissioner Townsend asked if the commission was splitting hairs about the disapproval of the siding on the front façade, but Commissioners Hood and Parker replied they were not. Commissioner Grant wondered about the original condition of the siding and stem wall. Commissioner Evans stated the original condition of the siding was present on the sides of the house, and Commissioners Ellington, Sanders, and Parker agreed. Commissioner Sanders asked if the wider siding beneath the water table was an original feature, and Commissioner Turner stated the water table appeared original but he did not know what was underneath the siding. Commissioner Grant doubted the treatment of the water table was original and stated it could have been some sort of concrete block. Ms. Good replied that a rusticated block stem wall was present. Commissioner Grant guessed that rusticated blocks or shake siding may have originally run up to the water table, but Commissioner Parker stated that the band of wider lap siding around the water table was not uncommon in the neighborhood. Commissioner Sanders recalled that the subcommittee had recommended denial of Item 3 in hopes that the wider siding might be present underneath the new novelty siding on the front façade. Commissioners Parker and Ellington doubted the wider siding was still present. Commissioner Grant observed that the ends of the landing at the front of the house were open. Commissioner Parker stated the boards around the landing were inappropriate, although she agreed it was nice that the foundation of the house could not be seen underneath. Commissioner Evans asked what would happen if the preservation commission denied the proposal. Commissioner Parker noted the house had been in violation of the HP Permit requirement already and stated that code enforcement would be notified. Commissioner Sanders stated that the applications for all three (3) addresses were a result of the City's efforts to help the applicant come

into compliance and asked staff for context. Ms. Good replied that the owner had contacted her city councilor about other types of applications with the City that had not been approved. Ms. Good stated that she, other City staff, and Councilor Hall-Harper had met with the property owner and her business partners, and that the owner had agreed to submit HP Permit applications for all three (3) properties in The Heights with outstanding HP Permit violations. Commissioner Hood asked if the owner was renting or selling the properties, and Ms. Good stated that all three (3) properties were currently owned by Massey's Properties, LLC. Commissioner Hood wondered if they were short-term rentals and stated that a City license is also required for Airbnbs. Commissioner Hood stated that, from his perspective as an architect, if all required City permits are not obtained, a building cannot be occupied and fines could be issued. Commissioner Hood asked why that had not happened in this case. Commissioner Parker stated that she was not sure how to proceed. Commissioner Grant stated that he was inclined to disapprove of Item 4 because of the openings on either end of the landing that were visible from the street. Commissioner Hood stated that he was inclined to deny the entire application due to the applicant's absence. Commissioner Turner agreed with Commissioner Grant's proposal to deny Item 4 since there had been no treatment of the ends of the landing. Commissioner Parker suggested considering each proposal separately and expressed acceptance of Item 1 and Item 2 because they returned the building to its original use as a duplex. Commissioner Grant agreed. However, Commissioner Parker did not support Item 3 because the front of the house did not match the sides of the house and Item 4 because it appeared to be unfinished.

Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve Item 1: Removal of door on north façade and Item 2: Replacement of two (2) windows with two (2) doors on north façade. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and passed with a majority. Commissioner Hood observed that the siding had not been feathered-in where the door had been removed.

Vote: 12 W. Latimer St. (Brady Heights/The Heights)

Item 1: Removal of door on north façade and Item 2: Replacement of two (2) windows with two (2) doors on north façade

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

Commissioner Turner made a motion to deny Item 3: Replacement of cedar lap siding with novelty siding above stem wall on north façade and Item 4: Replacement of lattice with wood skirting around porch with the rationale that the lap siding around the water table does not match the original siding present elsewhere on the residence and the skirting around the porch was unfinished on the ends of the porch. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and passed unanimously.

Vote: 12 W. Latimer St. (Brady Heights/The Heights)

Motion to deny Item 3: Replacement of cedar lap siding with novelty siding above stem wall on north façade and Item 4: Replacement of lattice with wood skirting around porch

In Favor

1. Parker
2. Sanders
3. Ellington
4. Bumgarner
5. Evans
6. Grant
7. Hood
8. Townsend
9. Turner

Opposed

Abstaining

Not Present

McKee

4. HP-0485-2023 / 1103 N. Cheyenne Ave. (Brady Heights/The Heights)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 15, 2023

Applicant: Mallory Massey

Proposals:

1. Replacement of brackets in gable over porch
2. Replacement and installation of vents in gables
3. Replacement and installation of fascia
4. Installation of band of wood lap siding between stem wall and windowsills
5. Replacement of rail and columns on porch on west side of residence
6. Replacement of windows
7. Removal of windows on east-facing walls
8. Relocation of door on east façade
9. Replacement of deck on east side of residence
10. Installation of garage door
11. Construction of retaining walls on south side of residence

Project completed without an historic preservation permit

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Mallory Massey, was not present. Commissioner Sanders reported that the HP Permit Subcommittee had the general impression that the project as completed improved the property and exhibited good craftsmanship overall. Commissioner Sanders noted that there had been an attempt to return some historic character to the home and that the subcommittee was okay with the brackets, window configuration toward the back of the house, relocation of the rear door, and garage door. Commissioner Sanders reported that, except for the replacement of windows, which the Unified Design Guidelines require to match the original window material in The Heights, the subcommittee felt the project was an appropriate remodel. Commissioner Sanders stated that the subcommittee recommended approval of the application except for the windows and the porch rail because they found the proportions of the rail to be not quite right. Commissioner Sanders added that Neighborhood Representative Jeremy Brennan had been active at the meeting during the review of all three (3) applications, had worked on several homes in The Heights, lived in The Heights, and had been a great resource for understanding the characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood. Commissioner Parker stated that she also had an issue with the replacement and removal of windows, as parts of the house were devoid of windows compared to their previous appearance. Commissioner Turner asked for clarification about the rail, and Ms. Good replied that the HP Permit Subcommittee had recommended approval of the rail with

the condition that it be reduced in height. Commissioner Turner accepted the rail as constructed and stated that he was supportive of every item except Items 6 and 7. Commissioner Parker stated that she also did not support Item 11 because the retaining wall was constructed from cinder block. Commissioner Turner wondered what was present before. Upon review of previous photographs of the house, commissioners agreed that a poured concrete wall had previously been present. Commissioner Hood stated that, depending on the height of the wall, building permits may have been required. Commissioner Grant stated that the project overall had made a big improvement to the house and that he was willing to support all items except the replacement of the windows. Commissioner Parker stated that the Unified Design Guidelines do not allow cinderblock walls. Commissioner Grant wondered if the wall would be considered part of the stem wall rather than a retaining wall if it connected to the foundation of the house and stated that the only other option would be the construction of a wall from poured concrete. Commissioner Townsend suggested applying stucco to the face of the wall, as had been proposed on other residences, and Commissioner Evans stated that a concrete slurry, stucco, or stucco-like material such as EIFS might be possible. Commissioner Turner recited Guideline G.1.5, which stated that cinder block, segmental retaining wall systems, corrugated metal, and railroad ties are not allowed. Commissioner Sanders stated that it creates a problem when Work is completed before HP Permit approval is sought. Commissioner Grant noted the Prairie Style divisions in the windows between the panes of glass. Commissioner Parker noted that the previous windows had been wood.

Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the following items:

- 1: Replacement of brackets in gable over porch,
- 2: Replacement and installation of vents in gables,
- 3: Replacement and installation of fascia,
- 4: Installation of band of wood lap siding between stem wall and windowsills,
- 5: Replacement of rail and columns on porch on west side of residence,
- 7: Removal of windows on east-facing walls,
- 8: Relocation of door on east façade,
- 9: Replacement of deck on east side of residence, and
- 10: Installation of garage door.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sanders and passed with a majority.

Vote: 1103 N. Cheyenne Ave. (Brady Heights/The Heights)

Item 1: Replacement of brackets in gable over porch, Item 2: Replacement and installation of vents in gables, Item 3: Replacement and installation of fascia, Item 4: Installation of band of wood lap siding between stem wall and windowsills, Item 5: Replacement of rail and columns on porch on west side of residence, Item 7: Removal of windows on east-facing walls, Item 8: Relocation of door on east façade, Item 9: Replacement of deck on east side of residence, and Item 10: Installation of garage door.

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

Commissioner Townsend made a motion to deny Item 6: Replacement of windows and Item 11: Construction of retaining walls on south side of residence on the basis of Guidelines A.4.5.1 and G.1.5 in the Unified Design Guidelines for Residential Structures. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sanders and passed unanimously.

Vote: 1103 N. Cheyenne Ave. (Brady Heights/The Heights)

Motion to deny Item 6: Replacement of windows and Item 11: Construction of retaining walls on south side of residence

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

Commissioner Bumgarner asked what the next steps would be for the denied items. Ms. Good stated that the applicant could submit an amended application for the items that were denied or could appeal the decision to the Board of Adjustment within ten (10) days. If neither occurred, staff would contact Code Enforcement and ask that they pursue further enforcement. Commissioner Grant asked about occupancy, and Commissioner Parker stated that the house was used as an Airbnb. Commissioner Bumgarner wondered if the City's Airbnb permit was conditioned on compliance with other City permits. Ms. Good stated that it was a license through the City but she was unsure what the standards were. Commissioner Sanders asked legal staff to look into the question. Commissioner Grant stated that the owner had repeatedly ignored the HP Permit requirement. Commissioner Turner asked if code enforcement had the ability to levy fines. Ms. Good stated that, at some point fines could be issued once a criminal citation was issued. Commissioners Parker and Bumgarner noted the property had been in violation since 2019. Commissioner Grant stated that, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the preservation commission had established a committee to address enforcement issues and suggested they pursue that again.

5. **HP-0486-2023 / 819 N. Cheyenne Ave.** (Brady Heights/The Heights)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 15, 2023

Applicant: Mallory Massey

Proposals:

1. Replacement of stem wall
2. Installation of windows in stem wall
3. Removal of window on south side of residence
4. Replacement of front door
5. Replacement of columns, rail, and floor on porch
6. Installation of horizontal lap siding over stem wall on porch
7. Removal of chimney

Project completed without an historic preservation permit

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Mallory Massey, was not present. Commissioner Parker stated that the original door had not previously been present,

and Ms. Good confirmed that a slab door with a storm door had been present prior to the replacement of the front door. Commissioner Parker noted the asymmetrical muntin pattern in the door was strange. Ms. Good stated that a fourth muntin might be missing in the glazing. Commissioner Sanders reported that this application was the easiest of the three (3) applications to review and that there was a mix of good and bad alterations. Commissioner Sanders reported that the HP Permit Subcommittee had been impressed with the intricate replication of the original columns on the porch and appreciated that the original windows were intact, except for the one window that had been removed on the side of the house. Commissioner Sanders reported that the subcommittee recommended denial of the skirting around the porch in hopes that the porch would be returned to its original appearance with lattice. Commissioner Sanders reported that the subcommittee had recommended approval of the replacement of the stem wall, but he wondered if the prohibition against concrete masonry units applied to stem walls. Commissioner Parker clarified that the guideline applied to retaining walls as landscape features, not stem walls. Commissioner Sanders clarified that the previous rusticated block stem wall had been replaced with concrete masonry units. Commissioner Grant asked if the windows in the stem wall led to a basement, and Ms. Good stated there was some sort of basement or crawl space at the rear of the house. Commissioner Townsend wondered about the reason for removing the block, and Commissioner Parker stated that the entire stem wall had been removed and rebuilt. Commissioner Grant expressed concern about the lack of a building permit for the structural work and stated that the City of Tulsa Permit Center should be notified. Commissioner Hood pointed out that even a structural permit for a set of wooden stairs required signed and sealed plans. Commissioner Hood observed that it appeared the masonry supports at the corners of the porch below the porch floor had been removed, but the lap siding obscured the porch foundation. Commissioner Grant stated that the lap siding around the porch would not have been original and guessed that columns, piers, and a rail were previously present. Commissioner Grant stated that the masonry supports below the porch floor may have been for piers used as a base for the wood columns. Commissioners reviewed the photograph of the porch taken while Work was in progress in 2021 but could not reach a consensus about whether the masonry supports had been removed.

Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the following items:

- 1: Replacement of stem wall;
- 2: Installation of windows in stem wall;
- 3: Removal of window on south side of residence;
- 4: Replacement of front door;
- 5: Replacement of columns, rail, and floor on porch; and
- 7: Removal of chimney.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Evans and passed with a majority.

Vote: 819 N. Cheyenne Ave. (Brady Heights/The Heights)

Item 1: Replacement of stem wall, Item 2: Installation of windows in stem wall, Item 3: Removal of window on south side of residence, Item 4: Replacement of front door, Item 5: Replacement of columns, rail, and floor on porch; and Item 7: Removal of chimney

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

Commissioner Turner then made a motion to deny Item 6: Installation of horizontal lap siding over stem wall on porch on the basis that the lap siding around the foundation of the porch was not compatible with the original porch design and cited Unified Design Guidelines Section A.6. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Evans and passed unanimously.

Vote: 819 N. Cheyenne Ave. (Brady Heights/The Heights)

Motion to deny Item 6: Installation of horizontal lap siding over stem wall on porch

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

6. **HP-0492-2023 / 1607-1611 E. 17th Pl.** (Swan Lake)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 15, 2023

Applicant: Desmo LLC c/o Luis Santiago

Proposals:

1. Construction of walkway in street yard
2. Replacement of steps in street yard

Project completed without an historic preservation permit

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Luis Santiago, was not present. Commissioner Evans reported that the HP Permit Subcommittee had recommended approval of the application because the sidewalk was flat and not very visible from the street and because the stairs had been replaced in their previous location. Commissioner Parker noted that they were taller, and Commissioner Grant stated that the stairs were wider than the previous stairs. Commissioner Grant asked about the application of paint to masonry on the retaining wall and the wainscot around the house, and Ms. Good confirmed that the masonry had been previously painted. Commissioners expressed concern about the new steps, and Commissioner Evans observed that no landing was present at the top, creating a safety hazard. Commissioner Hood stated that the construction of the steps violated building code

requirements, and Commissioner Parker stated that the steps were not historically appropriate.

Legal staff suggested voting on each item separately. Commissioner Evans made a motion to approve Item 1: Construction of walkway in street yard. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker and passed unanimously.

Vote: 1607-1611 E. 17th Pl. (Swan Lake)

Item 1: Construction of walkway in street yard

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

Commissioner Townsend made a motion to deny Item 2: Replacement of steps in street yard on the basis of Guideline G.2.2. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker and passed with a majority.

Vote: 1607-1611 E. 17th Pl. (Swan Lake)

Motion to deny Item 2: Replacement of steps in street yard

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

7. **HP-0494-2023 / 1917 E. 17th Pl.** (Yorktown)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: None

Applicant: Jason Taylor

Proposal:

1. Installation of new floor on porch

Project initiated without an historic preservation permit

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Jason Taylor, was not present. Commissioner Townsend asked about the board that was cut off in front of the columns, and Ms. Good stated that the commission could make the extension of the front board across the column base a condition of approval if they were inclined to do so. Commissioner Hood stated that the new porch floor obscured the historic detail of the square column bases. Commissioner Sanders agreed and stated that the new flooring installed atop the old flooring destroyed the historic character of the porch because it took the definition off the base of the column.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to deny the application on the basis of Guidelines A.1.2 and A.6.1 in the Unified Design Guidelines for Residential Structures. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker and passed with a majority.

Vote: 1917 E. 17th PI. (Yorktown)

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

C. Reports

1. Staff Report

Staff reported on one staff-approved HP permit:

a. **1812 E. 16th PI. (HP-0493-2023)**

Installation of storm windows

Staff announced that Dr. Matthew Pearce, National Register Coordinator for the State Historic Preservation Office, would offer a National Register of Historic Places training following the November 9, 2023, preservation commission meeting.

2. Chair Report

None

D. New Business

Commissioner Grant requested that, in the future, the HP Permit Subcommittee ensure that applicants submit a detailed rail section when a rail is proposed.

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

None

F. Public Comment

None

G. Adjournment

Commissioner Parker adjourned the regular meeting at 6:29 P.M.