



TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, November 14, 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 Hood called the regular meeting to order at 11:01 a.m.

Members Present

Shane Hood, Vice-Chair
Katelyn Parker, RA, Secretary
Geoffery Evans, PLA, ASLA
Peter Grant, GMR, CAPS
Jackie Price Johannsen
Susan McKee, MFA
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.

Members Absent

Mark D. G. Sanders, Chair
Royce Ellington
James E. Turner, AIA

Staff Present

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

Others Present

Austin Chow, Kent Keith, Mike Mayes, Tom Neal, Jennifer Sharp,

2. Review and Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, October 10, 2024. Motion made by Commissioner Townsend to approve the minutes of the regular meeting on October 10, 2024. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant. The motion passed.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, August 22, 2024

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

B. Actionable Items

1. Nomination of the LaFortune Towers, located at 1725 Southwest Blvd, Tulsa OK to the National Register of Historic Places

Micheal Mayes, The National Register Coordinator from the State Historic Preservation Office, gave a brief presentation on the proposed nomination for the Lafortune towers.

Nomination of the LaFortune Towers, located at 1725 Southwest Blvd, Tulsa OK to the National Register of Historic Places

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

Cited Guideline (s): None

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

2. HP-0631-2024 /1868 E. 17th St. (Yorktown)

Applicant: Melissa Barrett

Proposals:

1. Replacement of front door and hardware
2. Installation of wall light(s)
3. Installation of mailbox
4. Installation of house numbers

Staff gave their presentation, and the applicant Mellissa Barrett was not present. Commissioner Hood reported that the door proposed by the applicant went well with the existing patterns and selected hardware. He mentioned that the subcommittee had requested a simple mailbox style and a simple design for the wall lights. Although the plans included two lights, he expressed that a single light would be more suitable, ultimately leaving the decision to the commission. He also pointed out that the plaque style for the house numbers presented by the applicant was not appropriate for the residence and requested a simpler design. He noted that the subcommittee had recommended approval of the conditions.

Commissioner Grant remarked that the light shown on the plan was positioned too low and concurred that a single light would be more fitting. Commissioner McKee agreed with Commissioner Grant's view, suggesting that the light should be placed on the right side, where there is more space between the window and the door. Additionally, Commissioner Grant proposed that the house numbers be positioned on the left side, situated between the window and the door siding.

1868 E. 17th St. (Yorktown)

Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application with the conditions that when facing the front door, the wall light is centered at the same height as the top pane of windows to the right and that the house numbers be installed on the siding on the left side between the door and window. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Townsend. The motion passed unanimously.

Cited Guideline (s): A.3.1, A.3.3, A.3.5, A.3.8, A.6.3, A.6.4, and A.7.3

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

3. HP-0633-2024/ 1123 S. Newport Ave. (Tracy Park)

Applicant: Jennifer Sharp

Proposals:

1. Replacement of front door and hardware

Staff gave their presentation, and the applicant Jennifer Sharp was present. Ms. Sharp stated that she is excited to be able to replace the current door that it will match the neighbor's door.

1123 S. Newport Ave. (Tracy Park)

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

Cited Guideline (s): A.1.1, A.1.3, A.2.3, and A.2.5

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

4. HP-0634-2024/ 217 E. 18th St. (Maple Ridge)

Applicant: Tom Neal

Proposals:

1. Porch rail height adjustment
Application to amend HP-0593-2024 approved by Tulsa Preservation Commission on July 11, 2024

Staff gave their presentation, and the applicant Tom Neal was present. Mr. Neal remarked that when both the contractor and the homeowner identified a safety issue regarding the rail height, they chose to proceed with construction rather than consult him for alternative options. He indicated that the approved height of (0',24") is

historically appropriate; however, he acknowledged that had he considered the significant drop-off on the west end, he would have proposed something different. He emphasized that since the structure has already been completely built, he is requesting the board's approval for it as it stands.

Commissioner Hood conveyed that he does not oppose the rail being constructed at a height greater than what was initially approved, particularly due to safety concerns. Commissioner Parker stated that tearing down the existing structure to install a guard rail would be inappropriate. Commissioner Hood further clarified that had this been a commercial project, compliance with IBC would have been mandatory, without regard for the construction of adjacent properties. Mr. Neal mentioned that if a shorter railing were implemented, it would necessitate the addition of a less visible element. Commissioner Grant commented that the railing resembles a fence obstructing the windows and does not align with the approved design. Mr. Neal added that had the applicant informed him that the railing was non-compliant with the code, he would have proposed alternatives such as bars or cables.

Commissioner McKee expressed her dislike with the railing extending from the top to the floor, noting that many older homes feature a significant gap between the floor and the railing. Commissioner Evans pointed out that the code stipulates that the gap between the floor and the railing must not exceed (0',4"), thus preventing that applicant from constructing it in that manner. He also remarked that adding an additional railing or cable would compromise the historical integrity of the home. He stated that the railing is consistent with the home's historical character and complies with the code.

Commissioner Grant clarified that while the code is important, it does not override the commission's authority, rather they work hand in hand. He said that he would not have approved the railing to obstruct a significant portion of the windows. Commissioner Evans asked how Commissioner Grant would preserve the historical character if not built to code. Commissioner Grant suggested constructing it at (0',24") and incorporating a discreet top rail, whether a bar, flat rail or a cable, that would remain almost invisible from the street view. Commissioner Evans responded that reducing the rail to (0',24") adding three cables may not be noticeable to an untrained eye, but those knowledgeable about the historical character of the homes would recognize that such materials are inappropriate. Commissioner Townsend expressed her belief that, based on the principle of lesser evil, cables or bars do not present a better solution and subsequently made a motion to approve the structure as built.

656 N. Cheyenne Ave. (The Heights)

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

Cited Guideline (s): A.6.5

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

5. Proposed amendment to Section 70.070-B of the Tulsa Zoning Code to require historic preservation (HP) permit review for accessory buildings and structures visible from the street and to exempt from review the installation of temporary landscape features.

Staff gave their presentation. Commissioner Parker inquired whether individuals wishing to line a planting bed with rock would need to seek approval. Staff responded that such individuals would be exempt from the requirement to obtain approval. Commissioner Hood remarked that rock is technically classified as masonry, which may lead applicants to question whether they need to seek approval, highlighting the vagueness in the current wording. Commissioner Mckee clarified that one material is bound by cement while the other is not. Staff indicated that what Commissioner Parker is referencing falls under standard landscaping that would be subject to review. They further noted that the matter currently before the commission pertains more to metal or plastic edging for flower beds and similar applications.

Commissioner Townsend observed that the term masonry lacks a universally accepted definition, suggesting that while the commission understands its implications, applicants may not. Commissioner Parker expressed that the language appears unclear to her and proposed substituting “masonry” with “landscape edging”. Commissioner Grant expressed his approval of the new zoning terminology, stating that the inclusion of the word “temporary” implies that the materials are not permanently affixed to the ground and can be removed. Commissioner Parker questioned whether the zoning code aims to exempt the segmental wall boxes like those that are available at Home Depot for constructing landscape edges.

Commissioner Hood noted that the stacking boxes are addressed in other sections of the code. Commissioner Grant commented that the ADU Committee had invested considerable thought into the zoning code changes and that the commission had not been tasked with redefining the existing language. The commission engaged in a discussion regarding applicants’ perceptions, the necessary inquiries they might make, and what actions could be undertaken as a matter of right. Commissioner Johannesen suggested that if the current wording prompts individuals to seek clarification, it may be beneficial to maintain that approach. Commissioner Parker inquired about the specific elements that the commission would exempt and those that would not be exempted, to which the staff responded that much of this information is detailed in the design guidelines. She further questioned whether the commission would also be approving rear yard patios that are visible from the street, including walkways or paving.

She noted that her entire property is fully visible from the street and asked if the paving aspect required review. City Staff, Felicity Good, clarified that the zoning changes aim to address anything that can be seen from the street. Commissioner Parker expressed her understanding that the purpose of the change was to facilitate the review of ADU’s. Staff indicated that this matter has been discussed extensively over the past nine months, leading to what they believe is the most effective solution. Commissioner Grant remarked that the intent of the amendment is to enhance property review and to eliminate significant loopholes in the code that allows for the construction of gazebos, ADUs, and garage apartments without review. Commissioner Parker acknowledged the rationale behind the amendment but expressed concern about potential backlash from individuals who may not fully grasp the reasoning behind the changes. Commissioner Hood mentioned that this issue was previously addressed in a full Commission meeting before preceding to the ADU committee, emphasizing that the goal was to simplify the process for individuals to

determine whether their project required Commission review. He pointed out that many individuals are currently unaware that anything visible from the sidewalk is subject to review, while other elements are not. He suggested that amending the zoning code would be the most straightforward way to address both the ADU concerns and the visibility issues. Commissioner Parker reiterated her position against reviewing all elements, stating that she believed the focus should be solely on structural reviews.

Commissioner Johannsen left the meeting at 12:07 p.m.

Proposed amendment to Section 70.070-B of the Tulsa Zoning Code to require historic preservation (HP) permit review for accessory buildings and structures visible from the street and to exempt from review the installation of temporary landscape features

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

Cited Guideline (s): NA

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

6. Proposed amendment to Section 70.070-E of the Tulsa Zoning Code to eliminate the 30-day time limit for decisions on HP permit applications.

Proposed amendment to Section 70.070-E of the Tulsa Zoning Code to eliminate the 30-day time limit for decisions on HP permit applications.

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

Cited Guideline (s): NA

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

C. Reports

1. Staff Report
None

2. Chair Report

Formation of nominating committee for 2025 officer elections.

Commissioner Hood asked if anyone would like to volunteer to be on the nominating committee. Commissioner Evans stated that he would volunteer to be on the committee.

D. New Business

None

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

None

F. Public Comment

None

G. Adjournment

Commissioner Sanders adjourned the regular meeting at 12:20 p.m.