HP PERMIT NUMBER: HP-0243-2020

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1624 SOUTH VICTOR AVENUE

DISTRICT: YORKTOWN HISTORIC DISTRICT

APPLICANT: TOM NEAL DESIGN

REPRESENTATIVE: NONE

A. CASE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION
   1. Replacement of platform and steps at entry
   2. Construction of enclosure for platform
   3. Installation of fixture
   4. Installation of rail
   5. Replacement of door on east facade

B. BACKGROUND
   DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: CA. 1926
   ZONED HISTORIC PRESERVATION: 1995
   NATIONAL REGISTER LISTING: YORKTOWN HISTORIC DISTRICT, 2002
   CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE: NO
   PREVIOUS ACTIONS:
   COA – JULY 12, 2001 – TPC APPROVAL
   1. Replacement of windows or cladding (optional) and installation of storm windows
      on casement stained-glass windows

   HP-17-066 – JUNE 19, 2017 – STAFF APPROVAL
   1. Removal of non-historic siding and replacement in kind of damaged historic material
   2. Removal of awnings

   HP-17-071 – JULY 25, 2017 – TPC APPROVAL
   1. Replacement of original and non-original windows
C. ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

1. Replacement of platform and steps at entry
2. Construction of enclosure for platform
3. Installation of fixture
4. Installation of rail
5. Replacement of door on east facade
   i. Proposed are the replacement of the platform and steps, the installation of a handrail for the steps, the construction of an enclosure of the platform, the installation of a fixture on the porch, and the replacement of the door on the east facade. According to the applicant, the new platform and steps would be similar in size to those presently on the residence and would be constructed with concrete and clad with masonry on their north and south sides. A metal handrail would be installed along the south side of the steps. To enclose the platform, the gable on the east facade would be extended.

   During the review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee on January 19, construction of the enclosure with clinker brick, rather than wood clad in shingles, was recommended. However, after consultation with the Owner, the Applicant has renewed the proposal for construction with wood clad in shingles and with the substitution of a lintel for the arch above the entry to the enclosure. The application has been forwarded with a recommendation for approval.


SECTION A – GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES

A.1 General Requirements
   A.1.1 Retain and preserve the existing historic architectural elements of your home.
   A.1.2 If replacement of historic architectural elements is necessary, match the size, shape, pattern, texture, and directional orientation of the original historic elements.
   A.1.3 Ensure that work is consistent with the architectural style and period details of your home.
   A.1.4 Return the structure to its original historic appearance using physical or pictorial evidence, rather than conjectural designs.

A.3 Doors and Door Surrounds
   A.3.1 Retain and preserve original historic doors and door surrounds, including frames, glazing, panels, sidelights, fanlights, and transoms.
   A.3.2 Do not remove, cover, or move existing door, sidelight, fanlight, and transom openings.
   A.3.3 To return the home to its original historic appearance, remove non-historic doors and replace them using physical or pictorial evidence of the originals. If no evidence exists, select doors and surrounds which are consistent with the architectural style of your home.
   A.3.4 To gain thermal efficiency, storm doors which maintain the appearance and allow maximum visibility of the original historic doors may be installed. Unfinished or clear-finished metals are not allowed. (Storm doors can be staff approved.)
   A.3.5 If replacement of deteriorated doors is necessary, select doors and surrounds which are consistent with the architectural style of your home.
   A.3.6 If replacement of deteriorated trim is necessary, match the appearance, size, shape, pattern, texture, and detailing of the original historic trim.
   A.3.7 When adding new door openings, maintain the proportions of the façade. Match the dimensions and trim details of other doors and surrounds on your home. Select doors and surrounds which are consistent with the architectural style of your home.
   A.3.8 Use clear glass in new or replacement doors and sidelights.
A.3.9 Exterior security bars and grilles are discouraged.

SECTION B – GUIDELINES FOR ADDITIONS TO EXISTING STRUCTURES

B.5 Porches

B.5.1 When adding a porch or expanding an existing porch, maintain the character, detailing, scale, rhythm, and proportions of the existing historic structure.

B.5.2 When enclosing porches with glass or screens, maintain the existing rhythms, scale, proportions, appearance, and character of the structure. Hard wall enclosure of porches is strongly discouraged but will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

B.5.3 Ramps may be installed when required to achieve access to the first-floor level. Construct the ramp so that, in the future, it can be removed without significantly altering the original historic structure. Designing ramps to access porches from the side, so the front elevation is not obscured, is encouraged.

SECTION E – GUIDELINES FOR NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURES

E.1 General Requirements

E.1.1 For the purposes of this chapter, non-contributing structures are those listed as not contributing to the historic character of the district due to age or architectural style in the National Register Nomination for the district.

E.1.2 Non-contributing structures will be considered products of their own time. Do not attempt to create a false appearance of the predominant character and architectural style of the rest of the district.

E.1.3 Follow Section A (Rehabilitation) and Section B (Additions) as they relate to the character-defining elements of the non-contributing structure.

E.1.4 Ensure that work on non-contributing structures does not detract from or diminish the historic character of the overall district.
TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

HISTORIC PRESERVATION PERMIT SUBCOMMITTEE
Thursday, February 4, 2021, 11:00 A.M.

A. Opening Matters
   1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum
      In the absence of Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Grant called the Regular
      Meeting to order at 11:00 A.M.

      Members Present
      Holly Becker
      Chris J. Bumgarner
      Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS
      Mark D. G. Sanders
      Matthew D. McAfee

      Staff Present
      Felicity O. Good
      Roy M. (Jed) Porter, Jr.

      Others Present
      Patricia D. Berry*, Michael R. Dankbar*, Eric Endecott, Tom Neal, Justin M.
      Schneider*

      *Present via Remote Access

   2. Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review
      a. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
         No Conflicts of Interest were disclosed.
b. Applications for Historic Preservation Permits

1624 S. Victor Ave. (Yorktown)
Applicant: Tom Neal Design

Proposals:
1. Replacement of platform and steps at entry
2. Construction of enclosure for platform
3. Installation of fixture
4. Installation of rail
5. Replacement of door on east facade

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, noting that the applicant had conferred with his client about the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee’s recommendation to construct the enclosure with clinker brick. The applicant commented that his client was not a fan of clinker brick, added that nearly one-third of the residence was clad in shingles, which was the material proposed for the exterior of the enclosure, and noted that the enclosure would not be connected to the facade of the residence, as its surface was irregular. Neighborhood Representative McAfee inquired whether the second story was original, and the applicant confirmed that the second story was an original feature. Commissioner Grant inquired about the treatment of the ceiling of the enclosure and was informed that the ceiling would be open, rather than enclosed, and that the fixture would be installed in the ceiling but would not be visible from the right-of-way. Commissioner Grant then inquired whether the gable of the enclosure would be open and was informed that the gable would be closed. Commissioner Bumgarner requested clarification of the proposal for the steps and was informed that the steps would be wider and deeper than they were presently, but their sides would not be clad with masonry. Commissioner Grant inquired about the treatment of the materials and was informed that the interior surface of the enclosure would be clad in tongue-and-groove boards and that the beam would be expressed, rather than concealed. Commissioner Bumgarner requested the rationale for the placement of the rail, and the applicant indicated that the placement at the edge of the steps was the owner’s preference. Commissioner Grant requested the dimensions of the steps and was informed that the risers were seven-and-a-half inches (7-1/2”) in height and the treads were fifteen inches (15”) in depth. The applicant commented that the construction of the enclosure with its intrusion into the setback had been approved by the Board of Adjustment. Commissioner Sanders inquired about the fixture proposed for installation, and the applicant noted that the fixture had been selected by the owner and that the fixture would only be visible upon entry into the enclosure. Commissioner Bumgarner inquired whether the vent on the original gable would be retained and was informed that the vent would indeed be retained but would not be reproduced on the gable of the enclosure. Commissioner Sanders expressed his opinion that the project rendered a disservice to the residence but did not adversely affect the character of the district. Commissioner Becker inquired whether the spatial configuration of the residence was original and was informed that the interior of the residence had not been altered.
As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Bumgarner made a motion to recommend approval of the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Becker and was approved unanimously.

Vote: 1624 S. Victor Ave. *(Yorktown)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumgarner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1521 E. 21st St. *(Swan Lake)***  
Applicant: Jeffrey D. Bacon  
Proposal:  
1. Installation of fence  
*Work completed without an Historic Preservation Permit*

Discussion:  
- Staff presented its report, and afterwards the applicant commented that the panels on the west side of the site which were six feet (6'-0") in height have been removed and would be replaced by panels which would be four feet (4'-0") in height to match the height of the wooden fence on the north side of the site and noted that the fence in the street yard would eventually be concealed by vegetation. Commissioner Sanders confirmed the removal of the fence, requested the height of the retaining wall on the west side of the site, and was informed that the height was approximately eight feet (8'-0"). Commissioner Grant inquired about the position of the gate for pedestrians near the sidewalk and was informed that an extension of the wall southward to accommodate installation of the gate had been considered but was dismissed as the gate would have swung too close to the sidewalk.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Sanders made a motion to recommend approval of the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bumgarner and was approved unanimously.

Vote: 1521 E. 21st St. *(Swan Lake)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumgarner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1006 E. 17th Pl. (North Maple Ridge)
Applicant: Property Arts Construction
Proposal:
1. Replacement of rail

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, and afterwards Mr. Endecott, the representative for Property Arts Construction, commented that the owners had requested replacement of the rails due to their condition with an increase in the height of the new rails to provide a safe enclosure for their children. In response to several inquiries about the design, Mr. Endecott noted that the balusters would have a space of one-and-a-half inches (1-1/2") between them and that the positions of the posts were adjusted to accommodate the locations of the windows. Commissioner Sanders inquired whether full posts could be installed and was informed that half-sized posts enabled easier repair of the vinyl siding. Commissioner Bumgarner inquired about the treatment of the surface of the roof and was informed that a floor would not be installed. Commissioner Sanders inquired whether the position of the post and rail on the west side could be shifted to permit installation of a half-sized post, which would match the appearance on the east side. Mr. Schneider, the owner, agreed to an adjustment of the position of the post and rail.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Sanders made a motion to recommend approval of the application with the condition that the post and rail be installed between the window and the door on the west side to permit construction of a half-sized post. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bumgarner and was approved unanimously.

Vote: 1006 East 17th Place (North Maple Ridge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumgarner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2203 E. 17th Pl. (Yorktown)
Applicant: Patricia D. Berry
Proposal:
1. Construction of residence

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, and afterwards the applicant declined to comment. Commissioner Grant inquired about the finished floor elevation, and Mr. Dankbar, the applicant’s Architect, responded that, as the survey of the site had not been completed, the exact height was not known but added that a height between two feet (2'-0") and two feet and six inches (2'-6") would be anticipated due to the slope of the site. Commissioner Grant noted the preference for the expression of a water table. Mr. Dankbar
commented on this gesture elsewhere in Barnard Trace and its expression with rowlock masonry. Commissioner Bumgarner commented that some delineation would be appropriate, and Commissioner Grant proposed that expression could be achieved by a modest projection of the stucco. In response to this proposal, Mr. Dankbar commented on the materials and methods of construction which could be adopted to achieve the objective. Commissioner Sanders requested clarification about the section and was informed that the facades would face a courtyard and would not be visible from the right-of-way. Commissioners Bumgarner and Sanders inquired about the selection of the material for the windows and the door and were informed that no material for the windows had been selected yet and that the door would be fiberglass but would not be visible from the right-of-way. Neighborhood Representative McAfee proposed that the stucco not be white, as there were already three adjacent residences painted white. The applicant commented that the finish would be ivory or taupe, rather than white. Commissioners Grant and Sanders expressed concern about the entry, as the door itself was not immediately visible, and proposed the installation of a double set of doors to face East 17th Place, but the applicant noted that the west facade, which included a view of the entry and doorway, was intended to engage the neighbors visually, presenting a facade with variety, rather than a blank wall.

As there was no further discussion, the applicant agreed to extend the review until the next Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. Prior to the review, additional documentation will be submitted, including a representation of the water table, an indication of the texture of the stucco, and Product Data for the shingles, the door and its hardware, and any fixtures on the exterior of the residence.

B. New Business
Neighborhood Representative McAfee inquired about the mitigation of the installation of the equipment by American Electric Power in the Yorktown Historic Preservation Overlay District. Staff has contacted the Owner for a report on the status of the effort towards mitigation of the appearance of the equipment and has been informed that vegetation will be planted as soon as the seasons change. Mr. McAfee expressed concern about the alteration of the walkway as well and requested that the Owner submit an Application Form.

C. Adjournment
Commissioner Grant adjourned the Regular Meeting at 12:31 P.M.
HP PERMIT NUMBER: HP-0246-2021

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1521 EAST 21st STREET

DISTRICT: SWAN LAKE HISTORIC DISTRICT

APPLICANT: JEFFREY D. BACON

REPRESENTATIVE: NONE

A. CASE ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION
   1. Installation of fence
      Work completed without an Historic Preservation Permit

B. BACKGROUND
   DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: CA. 1928
   ZONED HISTORIC PRESERVATION: 1994
   NATIONAL REGISTER LISTING: SWAN LAKE 1998; ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION 2009
   CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE: YES
   PREVIOUS ACTIONS: NONE

C. ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS
   1. Installation of fence
      i. Proposed is the installation of a Montage Plus Classic Fence and Gates to provide security for the residence. The fence will be four feet (4'-0") in height, the gate for pedestrians near the driveway will be four feet (4'-0") in height, the gate for pedestrians in the yard will be six feet (6'-0") in height to accommodate the slope of the site, and the gate for the driveway will be six feet (6'-0") in height.

      During the review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee on January 19, additional documentation was requested. A Site Plan with the presentation of the fence as constructed and images of the fence with the connections between the sections were provided and reviewed by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee during its Regular Meeting on February 4. The application has been forwarded with a recommendation for approval.

          SECTION A – GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES
          A.1 General Requirements
             A.1.1 Retain and preserve the existing historic architectural elements of your home.
             A.1.2 If replacement of historic architectural elements is necessary, match the size, shape, pattern, texture, and directional orientation of the original historic elements.
A.1.3 Ensure that work is consistent with the architectural style and period details of your home.

A.1.4 Return the structure to its original historic appearance using physical or pictorial evidence, rather than conjectural designs.

SECTION G – GUIDELINES FOR LANDSCAPE FEATURES, PAVING, AND SIGNAGE

G.1 Landscape Feature

G.1.1 Retain and preserve original historic walls, fencing, lighting, planters, and other landscape features through repair.

G.1.4 Use fencing materials that are consistent with the historic fencing found along the same street and within the district. Chain-link fencing, wire fencing (12 gauge or less), vinyl fencing, or any fencing that blocks the view of structures is not allowed.
DOUBLE RING Adornment option

1½" MONTAGE PLUS™ Rail
(See Cross- Section Below)

Post 2½" x 16ga.

⅛" 18ga Picket

Bracket Options

3½" TYPICAL

36" Min.
Footing Depth

2" Nom.

Varies With Height

Standard Heights
3', 3½', 4', 5', 6'

8' O.C. Nom.

NOTES:
1.) Post size depends on fence height and wind loads. See MONTAGE PLUS™ specifications for post sizing chart.
2.) Third rail required for Double Rings.
3.) Available in 3" air space and/or Flush Bottom on most heights.

RAKING DIRECTIONAL ARROW
Welded panel can be raked 30" over 8' with arrow pointing down grade.

E-COAT COATING SYSTEM

Base Material
Uniform Zinc Coating
(Hot Dip)
Zinc Phosphate Coating
Epoxy Primer
Acrylic Topcoat

MONTAGE PLUS™ RAIL

⅛"

⅛"

PROFUSION™ WELDING PROCESS
No exposed welds. Good Neighbor profile - Same appearance on both sides

MONTAGE PLUS™ RAIL
Specially formed high strength architectural shape.

LINE BOULEVARD BRACKET
UNIVERSAL BOULEVARD BRACKET
FLAT MOUNT BRACKET

Values shown are nominal and not to be used for installation purposes. See product specification for installation requirements.
Single gate Arrangement

NOTES:
1.) Post size depends on fence height, weight and wind loads.
   See MONTAGE PLUS™ specifications for post sizing chart.
2.) See Ameristar gate table for standard out to outs. Custom gate
   openings available for special out to out/leaf widths.
3.) Additional styles of gate hardware are available on request.
   This could change the Latch & Hinge Clearance.
4.) Third rail required for Double Rung.

Double gate Arrangement

Values shown are nominal and not to be used for installation purposes. See product specification
for installation requirements.
HP PERMIT NUMBER: HP-0251-2021

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1006 EAST 17TH PLACE

DISTRICT: NORTH MAPLE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

APPLICANT: PROPERTY ARTS CONSTRUCTION

REPRESENTATIVE: ERIC ENDECOTT

A. CASE ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION
   1. Replacement of rail

B. BACKGROUND
   DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1920
   ZONED HISTORIC PRESERVATION: 1993: ORDINANCE AMENDMENT 2005
   NATIONAL REGISTER LISTING: MAPLE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT: 1983
   CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE: YES
   PREVIOUS ACTIONS: NONE

C. ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS
   1. Replacement of rail
      i. Proposed is the replacement of the rail on the roof of the one-story section of the residence and the rail on the roof of the porte-cochère. The new rail would be thirty-six inches (36”) in height and connected to posts which would be three feet and four-and-a-half inches (3’ - 4-1/2”) in height. The rail and posts would be constructed with cedar and painted white.

      During the review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee on February 4, discussion focused on the design of the posts and rails to ensure the similarity in their appearance. The application has been forwarded with a recommendation for approval with the condition that, on the west side, the post and rail be installed between the window and the door to permit construction of a half-sized post to match the appearance on the east side.
ii. Reference: *Unified Design Guidelines – Residential Structures*

**SECTION A – GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES**

**A.1 General Requirements**

A.1.1 Retain and preserve the existing historic architectural elements of your home.

A.1.2 If replacement of historic architectural elements is necessary, match the size, shape, pattern, texture, and directional orientation of the original historic elements.

A.1.3 Ensure that work is consistent with the architectural style and period details of your home.

A.1.4 Return the structure to its original historic appearance using physical or pictorial evidence, rather than conjectural designs.

**A.5 Roofs**

A.5.1 Retain and preserve the original historic roof form (hipped, gabled, etc.) and pitch.

A.5.2 Do not remove character-defining architectural features of your roof, including, but not limited to, dormers, chimneys, cupolas, eaves, soffits, fascia boards, and decorative details, such as eave brackets, exposed rafter tails, or corbels.

A.5.3 If replacement of deteriorated architectural roof features is necessary, use materials that maintain the character of the structure and the size, shape, pattern, texture, dimensions, and directional orientation of the original historic roof features.

.1 Elmwood – Match the original historic roof material

1006 East 17th Place – North Facade