



TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, January 11, 2024, 11:00 a.m.

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

A. Opening Matters

1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum

Commissioner Sanders called the regular meeting to order at 11:04 a.m.

Members Present

Mark D. G. Sanders, Chair
Shane Hood, Vice-Chair
Katelyn Parker, RA, Secretary
Royce Ellington
Peter Grant, GMR, CAPS
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.

Members Absent

Geoffery Evans, PLA, ASLA
Jackie Price Johannsen
Susan McKee, MFA
James E. Turner, AIA

Staff Present

Caroline Guerra Wolf, Caleb Rocha, Skylar Marlow-Fuson, Rebecca Surber-Cantu,
Felicity Good, Steven Lassman

Others Present

Michael Schulz, Kelly Ishmael, David Hoffer, Terry Waska, Elizabeth Murry, Jeff
Richardson, Danielle Gurevitch, Dale Lawton

2. Review and Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 14, 2023

Commissioner Townsend made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting on September 14, 2023. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellington and passed unanimously.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 14, 2023

Motion to approve minutes

In Favor

1. Sanders
2. Hood
3. Parker
4. Ellington
5. Grant
6. Townsend

Opposed

Abstaining

Not Present

Evans
Johannsen
McKee
Turner

3. Review and Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 26, 2023
Commissioner Townsend made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting on September 26, 2023. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and passed unanimously.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 26, 2023

Motion to approve minutes

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

4. Review and Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, October 12, 2023
Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting on October 12, 2023. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hood and passed unanimously.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, October 12, 2023

Motion to approve minutes

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

5. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
Commissioner Townsend disclosed that she is friends with the applicants of HP-0528-2023 but did not have any conflict of interest in the project.

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0518-2023 / 1623 S. Madison Ave.** (North Maple Ridge)
Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Dates: December 7, 2023, and January 4, 2024
Applicant: Michael Schulz
Proposals:
 1. Removal of existing driveway
 2. Construction of new driveway
 3. Relocation of retaining wall east of driveway
 4. Relocation of fence in street yard

Staff presented its report. Commissioner Hood reported that the Historic Preservation (HP) Permit Subcommittee had reviewed the application twice and that the applicant had made the requested changes. Commissioner Hood described the changes to the proposal between the first and second subcommittee review, noting that the porte cochere was too small to accommodate a modern vehicle and that the curb cut and sidewalk would be adjusted to match the new driveway. Commissioner Hood added that the fence and retaining wall were existing conditions but that the applicant

indicated that they may be replaced in the future. The applicant, Michael Schulz, was present and had no additional comments.

Commissioner Sanders provided the context that the applicant had been before the preservation commission several times with projects and was making phased changes to the exterior of the house. Commissioner Sanders stated that he looked forward to a future application for an historically sensitive retaining wall along 17th Street. Mr. Schulz agreed and stated that replacing the entire wall with another material was not possible at this time. In response to a question from Commissioner Grant, Mr. Schulz confirmed that the existing driveway, including the approach, would be removed and the yard regraded. Commissioner Grant asked if the porte cochere was an original feature, and Mr. Schulz replied that he believed it was, based on the depth of the floor joists. In response to a question from Commissioner Grant, Mr. Schulz clarified that the existing retaining wall extended from the driveway to the east property line.

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

Vote: 1623 S. Madison Ave. (North Maple Ridge)

Motion to approve application

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

2. **HP-0532-2023 / 320 E. 19th St.** (North Maple Ridge)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: N/A

Applicant: Kelly Ishmael

Proposal:

1. Installation of handrail

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Kelly Ishmael, explained that the installation of the handrail was urgent because her mother-in-law had recently fallen from the rear steps and sustained injuries. Ms. Ishmael stated that she and her spouse had elderly parents with limited mobility, so the project was necessary for their parents to visit. Ms. Ishmael also noted that the same handrail had been installed on steps at the rear of the residence.

Commissioner Sanders noted that it was believed that the residence had been designed by Bruce Goff. Commissioner Sanders then asked the applicant if the handrail installed at the rear of the property had functioned well so far. Ms. Ishmael stated that the rail had been easy to install and provided a simple, effective way to adjust the size of the rail. Ms. Ishmael stated that the rail would be installed with a hammer drill, and a cap would be placed at the base of the posts to conceal the bolts.

Commissioner Sanders asked how the balusters were secured, and Ms. Ishmael stated that there were brackets with screws at the top and bottom of the balusters that were not noticeable. Ms. Ishmael emphasized that the rail was a good choice for a

quick, “do-it-yourself” project, that the style of the rail matched the house, and that it was secure. Commissioner Sanders asked if the pieces were welded together, and Ms. Ishmael replied that the pieces were not welded but fit tightly together and were secure. Commissioner Parker observed that the rail would be easily removable in the future, and Commissioner Townsend agreed. Ms. Ishmael agreed and stated that it had become a non-negotiable feature due to personal circumstances.

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

Vote: 320 E. 19th St. (North Maple Ridge)
Motion to approve application

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

3. **HP-0528-2023 / 1534 E. 19th St.** (Swan Lake)
Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: N/A
Applicant: Murali Iyengar & Kalpana Misra
Proposal:

1. Installation of handrails

Staff presented its report. The applicants were not present. Commissioner Sanders observed that the proposed rail appeared to be the same type as the rail approved for installation at 320 East 19th Street. Commissioner Ellington pointed out the presence of a cap at the base of each post, which would conceal the bolts.

Commissioner Grant stated that the described height of forty inches (3'-4") seemed too high and that a thirty-six-inch (3'-0") tall handrail would be standard. Commissioner Parker replied that it depended on the angle at which the height of the handrail was measured. Commissioner Grant stated that a forty-inch (3'-4") tall handrail would look more like a small fence and suggested that the distance between the tread and the top of the top rail be no more than thirty-six inches (3'-0"). Commissioner Parker agreed and stated that a standard height for a handrail would be between thirty-two inches (2'-8") and thirty-six inches (3'-0"). Commissioner Hood pointed out that the handrail in the product data appeared to be wide enough to accommodate only four (4) steps, rather than the seven (7) steps present at the property. Commissioner Hood indicated a willingness to approve the style of the handrails with the conditions that they fit all seven (7) steps and comply with the International Residential Code.

Commissioner Sanders questioned the presence of two (2) handrails and wondered if a single handrail at the center of the steps would be better, and Commissioner Parker agreed but replied that the steps were not wide enough to accommodate one (1) handrail at the center. Commissioner Hood expressed a preference for two (2) handrails and noted that they could be easily removed.

Commissioner Hood made a motion to approve the application on the condition that the handrails comply with the International Residential Code requirements for handrails. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellington and passed unanimously.

Vote: 1534 E. 19th St. (Swan Lake)
Motion to approve application with condition

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

4. **HP-0529-2023 / 2119 E. 20th St. (Yorktown)**

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: January 4, 2024

Applicant: Danielle Gurevitch

Proposal:

1. Installation of fence

Staff presented its report. Commissioner Hood reported that there was a precedent for similar fences in the neighborhood and that the HP Permit Subcommittee had requested clarification about the location, height, and style of fence proposed. Commissioner Hood noted that the fence would be placed at the top of the stairs in the front yard and would connect to the existing fence on the west side of the house. The applicant, Dr. Danielle Gurevitch, was present. Staff displayed the applicant's site plan, and Commissioner Hood described the boundaries of the proposed fence. Commissioner Hood explained that the gate on the east side would be located in the side yard and, therefore, was not being reviewed by the preservation commission.

Commissioners Grant and Hood asked about the location of the fence in relation to the curb running along the west property line. Dr. Gurevitch clarified that she planned to install the fence atop the curb and that the fence would terminate into the existing chain link fence, which was located west of the house. Commissioner Hood observed that the top of the fence would step down from the curb at the front of the property if it were installed on top of the curb, and Dr. Gurevitch confirmed it would. Commissioner Grant asked about the existing fence, and Dr. Gurevitch replied that it would remain in place and was also installed atop the existing curb. Dr. Gurevitch clarified that the proposed metal fence would connect to the existing chain link fence near the southwest corner of the house and noted that the two fences must connect to keep her dogs in the yard.

Commissioner Hood directed commissioners' attention to the southwest corner of the proposed fence, which would be approximately ten inches (0'-10") to twelve inches (1'-0") taller atop the curb than along the front of the property. Commissioner Sanders expressed the opinion that the effective height of the fence should be thirty-six inches (3'-0") as stipulated by the HP Permit Subcommittee. Commissioner Ellington recalled that the HP Permit Subcommittee had been concerned with maintaining a view of the house, especially since the slope of the yard would result in a rise of a few feet between the sidewalk and the bottom of the fence. Commissioner Sanders agreed.

Commissioners Sanders and Grant asked if the fence would maintain a level height across the site. Dr. Gurevitch stated that the top of the fence would step down from the curb but indicated a willingness to adjust the plan according to the commissioners' preference. Commissioner Grant stated that it would look better if the fence maintained a level height, with an initial height of three feet (3'-0") where the fence meets the front steps and bulkheads. Commissioner Hood agreed and suggested locating the fence just on the inside of the curb instead of atop the curb so the height would remain level between the south and west sides. Dr. Gurevitch accepted the suggestion and clarified the proposed style of fence—either the Universal Top Three-Rail or the Universal Top Double Picket manufactured by Independence Aluminum Fencing.

Commissioner Hood made a motion to approve the application with the conditions that the fence be installed in the yard at the inside of the concrete curb and that the height of the fence not exceed thirty-six inches (3'-0"). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and passed unanimously.

Vote: 2119 E. 20th St. (Yorktown)

Motion to approve application with conditions

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

The meeting paused as Commissioner Grant exited the room at 11:55 A.M. and resumed when he reentered the room at 11:57 A.M.

5. **HP-0533-2024 / 210 W. Latimer St. (Brady Heights/The Heights)**

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: N/A

Applicant: HW Heights, LLC

Proposals:

1. Installation of signs
2. Installation of light fixture
3. Installation of address numbers
4. Installation of mailbox
5. Installation of planter boxes

Staff presented its report. The applicant, David Hoffer, was present. Commissioner Sanders asked about the previous HP Permits that were approved at the property, and staff provided a summary. Commissioner Parker noted that the previous business signs had not been reviewed by the preservation commission. Mr. Hoffer stated that he wanted to complete the project appropriately, make sure the changes to the building were historically accurate, and ensure the neighborhood was amenable to the project.

In response to a request for clarification by Commissioner Parker, Mr. Hoffer confirmed that the planters would be freestanding, have a depth between ten inches (0'-10") and twelve inches (1'-0"), and be slightly recessed to fit between the existing pilasters. Commissioner Parker expressed approval of the minimal signage, and Mr.

Hoffer agreed, adding that the signs were small enough that they would not require a sign permit from the City of Tulsa and that the proposed lighting was necessary to see at night. Commissioner Sanders also appreciated the subtle signage.

Commissioner Grant stated that he loved the project and thanked the applicant for continuing to restore the building. Commissioner Grant then asked if the two (2) units were originally symmetrical and what the original door and window configuration was. Mr. Hoffer stated that the two units were now symmetrical. Terry Waska, also representing the applicant, stated that a 1983 photograph taken during the filming of the movie *Rumble Fish* showed the building's previous appearance. Mr. Waska stated the building was almost identical to its appearance in that photograph except for the number of transom windows in each storefront. In response to a question from Commissioner Grant, Mr. Hoffer described the condition of the windows and stated they would seal, repair, and paint them. Mr. Hoffer also noted that the current mailbox was stainless steel, and he felt the proposed black mailbox would be less noticeable.

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

Vote: 210 W. Latimer St. (Brady Heights/The Heights)
Motion to approve application

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

6. **HP-0527-2023 / 1530 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)**
Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: N/A
Applicant: Martha Sherrill
Proposal:
1. Replacement of retaining wall
Project completed without historic preservation permit

Staff presented its report. The applicant, Martha Sherrill, was not present. Commissioner Sanders asked about the previous material of the wall, and Commissioners Parker and Grant agreed that it appeared to be rock-faced block. Commissioner Parker stated that the contractor should have replaced the wall so that it maintained its original appearance. Commissioner Sanders asked if any of the materials had been retained from the portion of the wall that was replaced, but Felicity Good said she guessed that the materials had not been saved.

Commissioner Parker stated that the project would not have been approved if an HP permit application had been submitted prior to the completion of the work. Commissioner Parker continued, stating that concrete is not necessarily an inappropriate material, but the commission might have suggested replacing the entire length of the wall or another scenario. Commissioner Grant suggested an alternative treatment of the corner. Commissioner Parker stated that it appeared the contractor had placed the concrete against the dirt and did not reinforce or build it as a proper retaining wall.

Commissioner Parker asked if the owner had paid for the wall to be replaced, and Ms. Good replied that the letter submitted by the owner suggested that the contractor had replaced the fallen wall segment at their own cost. Commissioners then discussed how the wall had been replaced and whether the contractor or the owner would be responsible for resolving the situation. Commissioner Parker suggested denying the application and instructing the contractor to correct the work that had been done. Ms. Good clarified that she had been communicating directly with the owner, not the contractor. Commissioner Hood noted that the owner should have been aware of the HP permit requirement and that the Unified Design Guidelines addressed historic walls. Commissioner Parker felt that denying the application could give the owner standing to approach the contractor to fix the wall.

Commissioner Parker asked how this project took so long to reach the preservation commission, and Caroline Guerra Wolf stated that previous staff had advised the owner to apply for an HP permit shortly after the wall was built. Ms. Good agreed and stated that she had revisited the issue after receiving a follow-up email from a neighbor. Ms. Good stated that code enforcement then issued a notice of violation more recently.

Commissioner Townsend suggested providing a letter summarizing the issue that the owner could share with the contractor who had completed the work. Commissioner Grant emphasized that the wall was installed without approval from the preservation commission, and as completed, was not historically appropriate for the neighborhood. Commissioner Hood wondered if the plans for the adjacent City sidewalk repair specified that the contractor must comply with City of Tulsa permit and code requirements. Commissioner Parker expressed doubt that they did. Commissioner Grant agreed with the suggestion to draft the letter to help support the owner.

Commissioner Sanders summarized two (2) questions he felt were relevant to the discussion. His first question was whether the end result should be the reconstruction of a stone retaining wall matching the original wall, or the extension of the concrete wall along the entire property line. His second question was how the commission could best implement that outcome, whether through a denial, continuance, or another action. Commissioner Townsend noted that typically, applicants submit a proposal for the preservation commission to review and respond to, rather than the commission dictating the design of a project.

Commissioner Grant suggested denying the application and having an amended application come before the HP Permit Subcommittee for further discussion. Commissioner Sanders expressed a concern that denying the application would result in no further action and that the retaining wall would remain in its current condition. Commissioner Ellington agreed but stated that he felt the commission must deny the application as presented. Staff agreed to draft a letter to the owner. Commissioners Hood and Ellington agreed that the owner probably felt the City should be responsible for replacing the wall since it occurred during a sidewalk repair project.

Commissioner Townsend made a motion to deny the application and direct staff to draft a letter that the owner could provide the contractor stating that the work was completed without an HP permit, the application was denied because the wall was not historically appropriate, and a new appropriate solution should be proposed with a new application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellington and passed unanimously.

Vote: 1530 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)

Motion to deny application and direct staff to draft letter to owner

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

- C. Public Informational Meeting – Proposed amendment to the zoning map to add property to the Tracy Park Historic Preservation Overlay District
Applicant: Initiated by City Council
Location: City of Tulsa park located at the southwest corner of East 11th Street South and South Peoria Avenue

Staff presented information about the proposed HP Zoning Map Amendment to add property to the Tracy Park HP Overlay District, which had been initiated by the Tulsa City Council on December 13, 2023.

Steven Lassman with the City of Tulsa Department of Parks, Culture, & Recreation (Parks Department), stated that the Parks Department was confident that the recently adopted amendments to the zoning code and Unified Design Guidelines would not interfere with their ability to perform park services and provide amenities at Tracy Park. Mr. Lassman stated that the process had inspired the Parks Department to think about other historic parks where some of the same issues should be considered and that might pursue HP overlay zoning in the future. Mr. Lassman stated that the zoning code and guideline amendment process had been positive and, going forward, the Parks Department felt that Tracy Park would be a good addition to the Tracy Park HP Overlay.

Liz Murry, neighborhood representative for the Tracy Park HP Overlay District, stated that throughout the meetings for the zoning and guideline amendments, the neighborhood, preservation commission, and Parks Department were able to work toward getting on the same page, and she found that they were all working toward the same goal. Ms. Murry stated that many people living in the Tracy Park neighborhood had a special connection and personal ties to the park, and that the new guidelines and proposed HP overlay zoning at the park would be a huge asset for the neighborhood.

D. Reports

1. Staff Report

Staff reported on staff-approved HP permits:

- a. **620 N. Denver Ave. (HP-0530-2023)**
Repair of trim with in-kind material
Repair of balcony with in-kind material
- b. **1856 E. 17th St. (HP-0531-2023)**
Repair and replacement in-kind of window trim
- c. **210 W. Latimer St. (HP-0533-2024)**
Repair in-kind of window and door trim

d. **210 E. 18th St. (HP-0535-2023)**

Installation of storm windows

Staff reported on Work completed without an HP Permit at 1225 East 19th Street and 1024 East 19th Street.

Staff announced that the annual retreat would be held Saturday, January 27, from 9:00 A.M. to 12:00 p.m. at Cyntergy, 810 South Cincinnati Avenue. Staff requested that commissioners send discussion requests and RSVP for the retreat via email. Commissioner Hood asked that an agenda item be added concerning the identification of historic resources in City parks.

2. Chair Report

Commissioner Sanders encouraged attendance at the annual retreat and announced that he would make committee assignments in February.

E. New Business
None

F. Announcements and Future Agenda Items
None

G. Public Comment
None

H. Adjournment
Commissioner Sanders adjourned the regular meeting at 12:55 p.m.