



# TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

## REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

**Tuesday, October 24, 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 4:32 p.m.

#### **Members Present**

Katelyn Parker, RA, Chair  
Mark D. G. Sanders, Vice-Chair\*  
Royce Ellington, Secretary  
Shane Hood  
Susan McKee, MFA  
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.  
James E. Turner, AIA

#### **Members Absent**

Geoffery Evans, PLA, ASLA  
Peter Grant, GMR, CAPS  
Jackie Price Johannsen

#### **Staff Present**

Audrey Blank, Caroline Guerra Wolf, Caleb Rocha, Skylar Marlow-Fuson, Rebecca Surber-Cantu, Felicity Good

#### **Others Present**

Robert Bell, Tom Neal, Jeremy Brennan, Chance Dobson

\*Late arrival

#### 2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, August 22, 2023

Commissioner Townsend made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting on August 22, 2023. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hood and passed with a majority.

#### **Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, August 22, 2023**

#### **In Favor**

1. Parker
2. Ellington
3. Hood
4. McKee

#### **Opposed**

#### **Abstaining**

Townsend  
Turner

#### **Not Present**

Evans  
Grant  
Johannsen  
Sanders

3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest  
Commissioner Parker disclosed a conflict of interest as the applicant for HP-0513-2023 at 902 North Denver Avenue and agreed to recuse herself during discussion and action on that item.

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0504-2023 / 1704 S. Yorktown Ave.** (Yorktown)  
*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: October 17, 2023*  
Applicant: Tom Neal  
Proposals:
  1. Demolition of accessory building in street yard
  2. Construction of accessory building in street yard
  3. Construction of fence in street yard
  4. Construction of driveway

Commissioner Sanders arrived at 4:43 P.M.

Staff directed commissioners' attention to Section 70.070-F of the Tulsa Zoning Code and afterwards presented its report. The applicant, Tom Neal, was present and added that most of the street yard on the north side of the house contained paving, much of which would be removed. Mr. Neal explained the reason for the new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) was that the owner's family was growing, and they needed a space to work from home. Mr. Neal commented that the house was built in 1924 when automobiles were much smaller, so the garage needed to be updated to fit modern vehicles. Mr. Neal stated that he did his best to minimize the height of the ADU so it fit as well as it could in the context of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Sanders reported that the primary concern of the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee was the overall scale of the ADU and the height of the fence. Commissioner Hood echoed this concern that the building would be two (2) stories tall and that it might overpower the adjacent residences, and reported that the subcommittee had wondered if there was any precedent for two-story ADUs in the neighborhood already. Commissioner Hood reported that the subcommittee had agreed that the fence should not block the windows and decided to forward the application to the preservation commission.

Commissioner McKee stated that most garage apartments in the neighborhood are behind houses in backyards, and asked if the porte cochere would be retained. Mr. Neal stated that the existing house would not be changed and then discussed the driveways in relation to the ADU and the primary residence, noting the project would result in a reduction in concrete paving overall. Mr. Neal explained that the fence was proposed to allow for a larger yard area. In response to a question from Commissioner Parker, Mr. Neal confirmed there would be two (2) curb cuts on 17th Street.

Commissioner Turner asked staff if the demolition and construction of the accessory building was subject to the Historic Preservation (HP) Permit requirement, and Felicity Good stated that it was, because the building extended into the street yard. Mr. Neal stated he planned for the trim and other details of the ADU to match the primary residence as closely as possible. Commissioner Sanders asked if the ADU could be pushed back 10 feet south so it wouldn't be in the street yard anymore. Mr. Neal said that by doing that, it would take up what little backyard the homeowners had. Commissioner Sanders said that the ADU seemed out of scale and looked like its

own house, but it would not have that appearance if the ADU were tucked deeper into the lot. Mr. Neal expressed that he wished the issue had been discussed during the subcommittee review and stated that he thought the issue of scale may not be within the preservation commission's purview. Commissioner Sanders said that the preservation commission does deal with rhythm and expressed concern that the historic character of the residence would be compromised. Mr. Neal argued that the ADU would not alter the character of the house and would provide an asymmetrical balance.

Commissioner Turner asked if the ridgeline of the ADU would line up with the primary residence, and Mr. Neal replied that it would be close. Commissioner Sanders noted the apparent presence of a berm in the drawings. Mr. Neal clarified there was an elevation difference between the front and back of the proposed ADU and that they considered excavating part of the site to lower the ADU. Commissioner Hood stated that the finished floor of the garage appeared higher in the elevation than he thought it would in person. Mr. Neal suggested the addition of a stem wall to create a more balanced appearance, and Commissioner Parker agreed and suggested a height of at least two and a half feet (2'-6"). Commissioner Hood advised the applicant to consider the effect the change may have on the rear doors. Commissioners Turner and Parker advised the applicant to consider utility easements and zoning regulations, and Mr. Neal affirmed that he had done so.

After further consideration of the suggestion to reduce the height of the ADU, Mr. Neal agreed to measure the height of the existing structure and return to the next regular meeting of the Tulsa Preservation Commission with revised drawings. Commissioner Sanders thanked him for considering the compromise.

2. **HP-0508-2023 / 1218 S. Newport Ave.** (Tracy Park)

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: October 17, 2023*

Applicant: Chance Dobson

Proposal:

1. Expansion of driveway

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Chance Dobson, was present and described the radius that had been added to the proposed driveway at the request of the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. Commissioner Hood reported that the subcommittee had recommended a curved driveway so that the driveway and the approach on either side of the sidewalk would maintain the same width.

Commissioner Parker asked about the grade of the site, and Mr. Dobson stated that part of the yard would be regraded and added that the concrete would be mixed so that it matched the color of the existing driveway. Upon inquiries from Commissioners Parker and Townsend, Mr. Dobson clarified where the connection between the driveway and walkway would be.

Commissioner Sanders made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and passed unanimously.

**Vote: 1218 S. Newport Ave.** (Tracy Park)  
Motion to approve application

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

3. **HP-0510-2023 / 1124 N. Denver Ave.** (Brady Heights/The Heights)  
*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: N/A*  
Applicant: Douglas Schroeder  
Proposal:  
1. Installation of handrails

Staff presented its report. Jeremy Brennan was present as the applicant's representative. Mr. Brennan stated that a handrail would be installed on each side of the steps and would be about thirty-eight inches (3'-2") in height. Commissioner Parker asked if the steps would be repaired, and Mr. Brennan stated that they already had been. Commissioner Turner asked if the handrail would be constructed from welded steel, and Mr. Brennan confirmed it would be.

Commissioner Ellington made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and passed unanimously.

**Vote: 1124 N. Denver Ave.** (Brady Heights/The Heights)  
Motion to approve application

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

4. **HP-0513-2023 / 902 N. Denver Ave.** (Brady Heights/The Heights)  
*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: N/A*  
Applicant: Katelyn Parker  
Proposal:  
1. Replacement of light fixtures

Commissioner Parker exited the room during the discussion and voting on this item.

Staff presented its report. Commissioner Townsend approved of the selected fixtures. Commissioner Turner observed that the art glass in the two fixtures did not appear to match each other, but Commissioner Ellington stated that it looked the same in some photographs.

Commissioner Townsend made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKee and passed unanimously.

**Vote: 902 N. Denver Ave.** (Brady Heights/The Heights)

Motion to approve application

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

5. **HP-0505-2023 / 1624 S. Troost Ave.** (Swan Lake)

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: N/A*

Applicant: Blas Gaytan

- a) Request by applicant for motion to reconsider the October 12, 2023, denial of HP-0505-2023 Proposal No. 3, "Application of paint to unpainted masonry"; discussion and possible vote.

*(Written notice was provided as required by Article IV, Section 4, Rules and Regulations Governing Procedures of the Tulsa Preservation Commission.)*

- b) In the event reconsideration is granted, possible consideration of HP-0505-2023 Proposal No. 3, "Application of paint to unpainted masonry".

Audrey Blank explained the process for requests for reconsideration. Commissioner Sanders recalled that the preservation commission had reconsidered an application once about a year ago.

Commissioner Turner made a motion to reconsider the October 12, 2023, denial of HP-0505-2023 Proposal No. 3, "Application of paint to unpainted masonry." The motion was seconded by Commissioner Townsend and passed with a majority.

**Vote: 1624 S. Troost Ave.** (Swan Lake)

Motion to reconsider the October 12, 2023, denial of HP-0505-2023 Proposal No. 3, "Application of paint to unpainted masonry"

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

The preservation commission then reconsidered the October 12, 2023, denial of HP-0505-2023, Proposal No. 3, "Application of paint to unpainted masonry." Staff presented its report. The applicant's representative, Robert Bell, then presented additional information to the commission. Mr. Bell explained that the stem wall was damaged, and that the applicant put concrete filler in the cracks to fix it. Mr. Bell stated this created an unattractive situation, and the easiest fix was to apply paint to seal the stem wall. Mr. Bell stated the applicant had chosen a paint color to give the appearance of concrete or cement and added that the brick columns had also needed

to be sealed and repaired. Mr. Bell then referenced the Unified Design Guidelines and the way they addressed the ability to apply paint to masonry surfaces; however, Mr. Bell did not find a justification for painting the rock retaining wall. He stated the applicant was willing to remove the paint from the retaining wall, but he needed to do something to sustain the stem wall and the brick columns for a long time. Mr. Bell stated that the applicant should have asked for permission to paint the features first. Mr. Bell stated he thought the paint on the house was appropriate because paint had been applied to stem walls on several houses on Troost Avenue and a house on Trenton Avenue. Mr. Bell stated that painting stem walls was a common fix and that the Unified Design Guidelines give the preservation commission the ability to allow the application of paint for the purpose of preserving the features of the house. Mr. Bell agreed that the retaining wall should not have been painted, although it had also experienced deterioration, and stated his biggest concern was preservation of the stem wall.

In response to a request for clarification from Commissioner Sanders, Mr. Bell confirmed that the stem wall, brick pillars, and stone retaining wall were the three areas that had been painted. Mr. Bell emphasized that other houses on the same street had the same features painted. Commissioner Sanders stated that he did not care if ninety percent of the neighborhood had painted brick; they were unpermitted or had been done prior to the HP Overlay. Mr. Bell replied that the deterioration of stem walls was a commonality in the neighborhood, and applying paint was a solution. Mr. Bell stated he was asking, under Section A.1 of the Unified Design Guidelines, to keep the paint on the stem wall.

Commissioner Sanders replied that he had been convinced that the stem walls could be painted for the reasons stated. Commissioner Sanders stated that the guidelines prohibited the application of paint to brick and stone, not necessarily concrete. Commissioner Sanders stated that he saw was no justification for painting the brick piers or the stone retaining wall. Commissioner Sanders stated that the black, white, and grey look was popular now and speculated that the applicant painted the features to look modern, which was antithetical to the preservation commission's goals. Commissioner Ellington stated that, in the Tulsa area, the soil and foundations often move, and he had seen a number of houses where contractors fix the stem wall and blend it to match what it looked like before, using a clear sealant rather than paint. Commissioner Ellington found that what had been done to the stem wall was a mask, not a real repair, and that the applicant had repaired the wall cheaply rather than properly. Commissioner Parker observed that the patched cracks in the stem wall were a different color in the photos provided and emphasized that it seemed like the stem wall had been painted before the repairs were done. Commissioner Sanders agreed.

Commissioner Parker then observed that it appeared the stone retaining wall had been repaired with an improper material and then painted, but Commissioner Turner noted that those repairs to the retaining wall had been present in earlier photographs of the house. Commissioner McKee noted that unpainted stone retaining walls were common in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Parker emphasized that it appeared the stem wall had been painted and then the cracks filled in and asked about the date the photographs were taken. Mr. Bell replied that the photographs the commissioners were reviewing were very recent and added that he wanted to bring the application back because he felt the commissioners needed to hear his new information. Commissioner Parker said the

stem wall could have been repaired without paint. Commissioner Townsend summarized that the application of paint to the stone retaining wall and brick piers were inappropriate and that the commission should now discuss the stem wall.

Commissioner Townsend wondered if the stem wall had been previously painted, and Commissioner McKee stated that recent photos of the house show that the stem wall had not been previously painted. Commissioner Hood stated that photos show the applicant painted the stem wall first and then went back afterwards to fix the cracks, so the argument that the stem wall was painted to hide the cracks did not work for him. Commissioner Hood speculated that the applicant was looking for a reason for painting the stem wall after the fact. Commissioner Hood noted that the applicant had been to the preservation commission in February and June and therefore knew about the Unified Design Guidelines and the HP Permit requirement.

Commissioner Hood noted that much of the work on the house violated the Unified Design Guidelines, and that was the reason why he had not been willing to reconsider the application. Commissioner Hood emphasized that the application of paint was not protecting the features from deterioration, and stated that the brick and stone needed to be repaired correctly.

Commissioner Townsend made a motion to deny Proposal No. 3, "Application of paint to unpainted masonry." Commissioner Sanders asked if they could vote on each item separately. Commissioner Parker said they should first vote all at once since the motion had been made. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKee. Commissioner Sanders asked how the commissioners typically dealt with the fact that guideline A.2.5 only prohibits painting brick and stone, not concrete masonry. Commissioner Hood cited guidelines A.1.4 and A.2.3 which he felt also addressed the issue. Commissioner Turner pointed out that the stone wall was not original to the house and that effectively removing the paint would not be possible. Commissioner Parker suggested that the bricks on the piers could be turned around so that the unpainted sides were exposed, and Commissioner Turner suggested that the front retaining wall could be removed altogether and the yard regraded. Mr. Bell stated that he thought it may be possible to remove the paint from the stone but not the brick or stem wall.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Parker called for the vote on the motion to deny Proposal No. 3, "Application of paint to unpainted masonry." The motion passed with a majority. Commissioner McKee stated that she did not want to set the precedent for approval, and Commissioner Sanders noted that he would have voted to deny the application of paint to the brick piers and stone retaining wall if those had been separate motions.

**Vote: 1624 S. Troost Ave. (Swan Lake)**

Motion to deny Proposal No. 3, "Application of paint to unpainted masonry"

**In Favor**

1. Parker
2. Ellington
3. Hood
4. McKee
5. Townsend

**Opposed**

Sanders

**Abstaining**

Turner

**Not Present**

Evans  
Grant  
Johannsen

6. **HP-0514-2023 / 1619 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)**

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: N/A*

Applicant: Shelley Almeida

Proposals:

1. Alteration of door on west side of residence
2. Elimination and alteration of proposed windows
3. Substitution of material on stem wall and piers on rear addition

*Application to amend HP-0495-2023 approved by Tulsa Preservation Commission on September 26, 2023*

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Shelley Almeida, was not present. Commissioners Parker and Turner questioned what the material of the piers would be below the water table. Ms. Good replied that the applicant had indicated the piers on the rear porch would be wood instead of brick but had not addressed the material below the porch floor. Commissioner Parker noted the need for more information.

Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve Proposal 1: Alteration of door on west side of residence and Proposal 2: Elimination and alteration of proposed windows and to continue Proposal 3: Substitution of material on stem wall and piers on rear addition to the next regular meeting of the Tulsa Preservation Commission with a request for additional information. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker and passed unanimously.

**Vote: 1619 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)**

Motion to approve Proposal 1: Alteration of door on west side of residence and Proposal 2: Elimination and alteration of proposed windows, and to continue Proposal 3: Substitution of material on stem wall and piers on rear addition

**In Favor**

1. Parker
2. Sanders
3. Ellington
4. Hood
5. McKee
6. Townsend
7. Turner

**Opposed**

**Abstaining**

**Not Present**

Evans  
Grant  
Johannsen

7. **2024 regular meeting schedule of the Tulsa Preservation Commission and Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee**

Staff presented the proposed regular meeting schedule for the 2024 calendar year. Commissioner Townsend made a motion to approve the 2024 regular meeting schedule of the Tulsa Preservation Commission and Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sanders and passed unanimously.



**Vote: 2024 regular meeting schedule**

Motion to approve schedule

**In Favor**

1. Parker
2. Sanders
3. Ellington
4. Hood
5. McKee
6. Townsend
7. Turner

**Opposed**

**Abstaining**

**Not Present**

Evans  
Grant  
Johannsen

C. Reports

1. Staff Report

Staff reported on staff-approved HP permits:

a. **1124 N. Denver Ave. (HP-0509-2023)**

Repair and replacement in-kind of front steps

b. **710 N. Denver Ave. (HP-0503-2023)**

Repair and replacement in-kind of damaged wood elements on windows, trim, soffit, and wood floor on porch

Staff reported that the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission had recommended approval of the proposed amendments to the Tulsa Zoning Code and the Unified Design Guidelines for Non-Residential and Mixed-Use Structures. The proposed amendments will then go to the City Council for a final decision.

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.

Staff announced that the Tulsa Preservation Commission would consider a nomination of the Charles and Bertha Blevins House, located at 1838 North Norfolk Avenue, to the National Register of Historic Places at an upcoming regular meeting.

2. Chair Report

Commissioner Hood was appointed to the subcommittee by Commissioner Parker.

D. New Business

Commissioner Hood brought up his concerns with the guidelines and certain gray areas. Commissioner Parker said this type of thing is usually discussed at the annual retreat.

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

None

F. Public Comment

None

G. Adjournment

Commissioner Parker adjourned the regular meeting at 6:24 p.m.