HP PERMIT NUMBER: HP-0253-2021

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1624 SOUTH MADISON AVENUE

DISTRICT: NORTH MAPLE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

APPLICANT: DANIEL S. HILDEBRAND

REPRESENTATIVE: NONE

A. CASE ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION
   1. Removal of chimney

B. BACKGROUND
   DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1935
   ZONED HISTORIC PRESERVATION: 1993: ORDINANCE AMENDMENT 2005
   NATIONAL REGISTER LISTING: MAPLE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT: 1983
   CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE: NO
   PREVIOUS ACTIONS:
   COA – MARCH 21, 2000 – STAFF APPROVAL
   Replacement of walkway

   COA – AUGUST 14, 2003 – TPC APPROVAL
   Removal of retaining wall

C. ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS
   1. Removal of chimney
      i. Proposed is the removal of the chimney on the west side of the roof. The chimney, which previously served as the route for the flue, is no longer used, and the stack in the interior of the residence intrudes into a bedroom and the kitchen, according to the applicant. The Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee has forwarded the application 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.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.

**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
Tuesday, March 16, 2021, 4:30 P.M.

A. Opening Matters
1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum
   Commissioner Turner called the Regular Meeting to order at 4:30 P.M.

   Members Present
   James E. Turner, AIA
   Holly Becker
   Sally H. Davies
   Matthew D. McAfee

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

   Others Present

   *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. Madison Ave. (North Maple Ridge)
Applicant: Daniel S. Hildebrand
Proposal:
1. Removal of chimney

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, noting that the chimney served as the route for the flue, and the applicant added that the chimney did not seem to be a prominent feature. Neighborhood Representative Davies inquired about the role of the chimney in the interior of the residence and was informed that no fireplaces were served by this chimney. Ms. Davies then inquired whether only the section of the chimney above the roof could be removed. The applicant responded that Commissioner Grant had been consulted and advised the removal of the entire chimney, and Commissioner Turner noted that the code would not permit the retention of only the section inside of the residence. Neighborhood Representative McAfee inquired about the role of the other chimney and was informed that the chimney served two fireplaces.

As there was no further discussion, Ms. Davies made a motion to recommend the approval of the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. McAfee and approved unanimously.

Vote: 1624 S. Madison Ave. (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>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1501 S. Norfolk Ave. (North Maple Ridge)
Applicant: David C. Hoffer
Proposal:
1. Replacement of fence

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, noting that two sections of fence would be replaced, and the applicant indicated his readiness to accept any suggestions. In response to inquiries about the differences in height of the sections and the appearance of the fence, the applicant noted that the fence presently on the site was six feet (6'-0") in height and the apparent differences in height were due to the accommodation of the pool in the rear of the yard and added that the posts for the fence would be
concealed behind the planks. Neighborhood Representative McAfee inquired whether a gate would be installed, and the applicant indicated his preference for a gate on the east side of the fence. Commissioner Turner inquired about the appearance of the gate, and the applicant responded that the gate would not be a decorative element but would resemble the fence in its appearance. Staff reminded the applicant to submit an illustration with the position of the gate and Product Data for the hardware for review by the Tulsa Preservation Commission.

As there was no further discussion, Neighborhood Representative Davies made a motion to recommend the approval of the application with the conditions that the gate be installed on the east side of the fence and that the planks on the fence face outward. The motion was seconded by Mr. McAfee and was approved unanimously.

Vote: 1501 S. Norfolk Ave. *(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>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1591 Swan Dr.** *(Swan Lake)*

 Applicant: Christopher C. S. Manning

Proposal:
1. Replacement of terrace
   *Project initiated without an Historic Preservation Permit*

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, noting that the applicant had responded promptly to the Letter of Notification. The applicant offered an apology for the failure to submit an application and commented that the edge of the new terrace was aligned with the edge of the terrace previously on the site. Commissioner Turner inquired whether the amount of pavement exceeded the amount permitted by the Zoning Code, and staff will review the requirements and advise the applicant. Commissioner Turner then inquired about the treatment of the flagstones in the center of the terrace and was informed that the flagstones would be set in mortar and would be flush with the surface of the terrace. Commissioner Turner requested confirmation that no features—a fire pit, for example—would be added to the site, and the applicant confirmed that no features would be added to the site.

As there was no further discussion, Neighborhood Representative McAfee made a motion to recommend the approval of the application with the condition that the amount of pavement comply with the requirements for open space stipulated in the Zoning Code. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and was approved unanimously.
Vote: 1591 Swan Dr. *(Swan Lake)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1523 E. 19th St. *(Swan Lake)*

Applicants: Jodi F. and Andrew C. Jayne

Proposals:
1. Application of limewash to stone on facades
2. Construction of addition to porch
3. Construction of pergola in front of garage
4. Replacement of driveway
5. Replacement of deck

*Project initiated without an Historic Preservation Permit*

Discussion:
- **Staff** presented its report, noting the applicants’ prompt response to the Letter of Notification, and afterwards Mr. Jayne offered an apology for the failure to submit an application. The applicant commented that among the motives for the project was the desire to transform the appearance so that the residence would be less reflective of its period of construction and would be more compatible with historic residences in the neighborhood. Commissioner Turner inquired whether the color of the limewash matched the color of the stucco and was informed that the colors nearly matched.

The discussion then focused on the treatment of the deck on the east side of the residence and the section in front of the porch described by the applicant as the sitting area. The applicant commented that only the top of the rail and the top of the grill would be visible above the fence and that the addition of the frame around the entry to the deck was an attempt to enliven the appearance of the east facade. Commissioner Turner expressed his preference for the newly installed rail and did not object to the installation of the grill. The applicant noted that the masonry of the grill matched that of the chimney. Neighborhood Representative McAfee expressed his appreciation of the effort to fit into the neighborhood. The applicant then commented on the development of the sitting area, noting that, although masonry was preferred for the surface, concrete had been selected to resist the movement of the roots of the tree. Commissioner Turner commented that the feature described as the pergola was a better treatment for the entry to the garage than the planter, that the depth of the porch was appropriate for the neighborhood, and that the installation of the elements on the deck and the rail were acceptable due to their limited visibility. Concern about the amount of pavement in the vicinity of the porch was expressed by several members of the subcommittee.
As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to recommend the approval of the application with the condition that the proposals for the pavement and the deck comply with the requirements for open space stipulated in the Zoning Code. The motion was seconded by Neighborhood Representative Davies and was approved unanimously.

Vote: 1523 E. 19th 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>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1110 E. 20th St. (North Maple Ridge)
Applicants: Stacey R. and Eric B. Woolley
Proposals:
1. Construction of wall
2. Replacement of bulkheads
3. Replacement of walkway
4. Installation of fixtures at entrance to walkway
5. Removal of walkway between driveway and residence

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, and afterwards Mr. Woolley commented that the fence presently on the site had been retained for the safety of their children but its replacement with the wall was sought to create a more open vista for the lawn. Commissioner Turner requested information on the height of the wall, and Ms. Woolley responded that the height would be twenty-seven-and-a-half inches (0'-27-1/2") at its highest point. Commissioner Turner then inquired whether the wall would be located immediately adjacent to the sidewalk and remarked that this construction could face challenges. Ms. Woolley responded that the contractor had assured the applicants that the wall could be so constructed. In response to an inquiry about the width of the new walkway, Ms. Woolley noted that the new walkway would be more narrow, and Commissioner Turner encouraged the retention of the present width. In response to an inquiry about the bulkheads near the sidewalk, Mr. Woolley indicated uncertainty about their date of construction and could not confirm whether they were an original feature. Commissioner Becker commented that the construction of the wall would be an improvement of the site. A Site Plan with dimensions was requested.

As there was no further discussion, Neighborhood Representative Davies made a motion to recommend the approval of the application. The motion was seconded by Neighborhood Representative McAfee and was approved unanimously.
Vote: 1110 E. 20th St. (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>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2329 E. 17th Pl. (Yorktown)
Applicant: Creative Home Designs
Proposal:
1. Construction of residence

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, and afterwards Mr. Scamehorn, the representative of Creative Home Designs, commented that the surrounds on the windows would be precast concrete. Commissioner Turner commented on the presence of lintels, rather than arches, above the windows, and Mr. Scamehorn noted that the preference previously expressed favored this treatment. Neighborhood Representative McAfee requested confirmation about the material and was informed that the facades would be clad in masonry whose color would be a deep shade of red. Commissioner Turner requested presentation of a sample of the masonry. Mr. McAfee inquired whether the masonry would be painted and was informed that the masonry would not be painted. Mr. McAfee expressed concern about the height and mass of the residence, noting that few two-story residences were present in the district. Commissioner Turner requested a depiction in outline of the residence to the west of the site and inquired whether the window on the second story of the South Elevation was an actual window or merely a representation of a window. Mr. Scamehorn indicated that the window was inserted only for appearance, rather than to serve a room. Mr. McAfee inquired whether any fixtures would be installed and was informed that a lamp would be installed on the porch and that lamps would be installed on the sides of the windows on the first story of the South Elevation. Commissioner Turner recommended installation only on the porch. Mr. McAfee inquired whether the residence was designed for a client or was constructed for sale and was informed that the project was speculative.

Discussion of the scale of the residence resumed. A shift of the second story towards the rear of the residence was proposed, and the recently approved project located at 2203 East 17th Place was cited as an example. Several revisions were recommended, including the presentation of the profile of the adjacent residence, submission of a Site Plan with the location of the fence, substitution of wooden trim for the precast concrete around the vents, submission of Product Data for
the fixtures, removal of the precast concrete surround at the entry and substitution of a simply executed element in the masonry, and insertion of a precast concrete surround around the doorway. The applicant agreed to address these issues and submit revisions for review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee during its Regular Meeting on April 1.

3. New Business
   Neighborhood Representative McAfee inquired about the requirements for residency by members of the Tulsa Preservation Commission, and staff described the roles of the members of the Tulsa Preservation Commission, noting that most members resided in Historic Preservation Overlay Districts. Mr. McAfee inquired about the response of the owner of the property located at 2008 South Yorktown Avenue and was informed of the owner’s readiness to submit an application for approval of the installation of equipment by American Electric Power and the adjustment of the alignment of the walkway.

4. Adjournment
   Commissioner Turner adjourned the Regular Meeting at 6:28 P.M.
TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT
Tuesday, March 23, 2021
HP-0255-2021

HP PERMIT NUMBER: HP-0255-2021
PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1501 SOUTH NORFOLK AVENUE
DISTRICT: NORTH MAPLE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT
APPLICANT: DAVID C. HOFFER
REPRESENTATIVE: NONE

A. CASE ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION
   1. Replacement of fence

B. BACKGROUND
   DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1915
   ZONED HISTORIC PRESERVATION: 1993: ORDINANCE AMENDMENT 2005
   NATIONAL REGISTER LISTING: MAPLE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT: 1983
   CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE: NO
   PREVIOUS ACTIONS:
   COA – JULY 21, 1996 – TPC DENIAL
   Replacement of frame on door
   
   COA – AUGUST 30, 1996 – TPC APPROVAL
   Installation of trim around door
   
   COA – AUGUST 14, 2008 – TPC APPROVAL
   Removal of vinyl siding and repair of original wooden siding
   Reconstruction of original trim on windows
   Reconstruction of eaves
   Reconstruction of brackets under eaves
   Creation of square grids on ceiling of porch
   Installation of storm door on west facade
   Installation of Prairie Style Door on south facade
   Installation of stainless-steel caps on chimneys

C. ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS
   1. Replacement of fence
      i. Proposed is the replacement of the fence with a fence six feet (6’-0”) in height and constructed with cedar planks topped with a cedar cap and stained with a clear finish. A section of the fence—Fence 1—would extend from the northeast corner of the residence to the northwest corner of the detached garage, and Fence 2 would be located parallel to the sidewalk and extend from the rear of the residence to intersect Fence 1 west of the detached garage.
During the review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee on March 16, the applicant expressed a preference for installation of a gate. The application has been forwarded with a recommendation for approval with the conditions that the gate be installed on the east side of the fence and that the planks of the fence face outward.

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.

**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.

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

G.1 Landscape Features

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

G.1.3 Ensure that new landscape features are appropriate to the style of your home and consistent with the historic elements found along the same street and within the district.

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.
Fence 1 and Fence 2

Proposal – Replacement of Fence
Current trash containers are visible from 15th Street. I would relocate them behind the fence accessible from the new gate.

Proposal - Replacement of Gate
HP PERMIT NUMBER: HP-0257-2021

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1591 SWAN DRIVE

DISTRICT: SWAN LAKE HISTORIC DISTRICT

APPLICANT: CHRISTOPHER C. S. MANNING

REPRESENTATIVE: NONE

A. CASE ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION
   1. Replacement of terrace
      Project initiated without an Historic Preservation Permit

B. BACKGROUND
   DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: CA. 1980
   ZONED HISTORIC PRESERVATION: 1994
   NATIONAL REGISTER LISTING: SWAN LAKE 1998; ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION 2009
   CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE: NO
   PREVIOUS ACTIONS:
   HP-17-063 – JUNE 27, 2017 – TPC APPROVAL
   Construction of second-story addition and balcony
   Replacement of two doors and wall with three French Doors
   Replacement of window in Study with French Door
   Construction of pergola in street yard

   HP-18-030 – JUNE 14, 2018 – TPC APPROVAL
   Construction of walkway and steps in street yard
   Installation of fence in street yard

   HP-18-030 – AUGUST 28, 2018 – TPC APPROVAL
   Construction of carport in street yard

   HP-18-030 – AUGUST 28, 2018 – TPC DENIAL
   Installation of garage door at entry to carport

C. ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS
   1. Replacement of terrace
      i. Proposed is the replacement of the terrace. According to the applicant, the terrace was
         formerly constructed with flagstone, which was unstable, and the gaps between the flag-
         stones were filled with rocks, which had become loose—creating a surface which was
         increasingly hazardous. The new terrace has been constructed with concrete, and any
         flagstones have been set in mortar.
During the review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee on March 16, discussion focused on the size of the terrace. The application has been forwarded with a recommendation for approval with the condition that the amount of pavement comply with the requirements for open space stipulated in the Zoning Code.

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.

**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.

**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.1.2 Removal of historic landscape features will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Removal of non-historic landscape features can be staff-approved.

G.1.3 Ensure that new landscape features are appropriate to the style of your home and consistent with the historic elements found along the same street and within the district.

1591 Swan Drive – March 2021
HP PERMIT NUMBER: HP-0254-2021

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1523 EAST 19TH STREET

DISTRICT: SWAN LAKE HISTORIC DISTRICT

APPLICANTS: JODI F. AND ANDREW C. JAYNE

REPRESENTATIVE: NONE

A. CASE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION
   1. Application of limewash to stone on facades
   2. Construction of addition to porch
   3. Placement of pavement adjacent to addition to porch
   4. Construction of pergola in front of garage
   5. Replacement of driveway
   6. Construction of frame around doorway on east facade
   7. Construction of pergola on deck
   8. Replacement of deck

   Project initiated without an Historic Preservation Permit

B. BACKGROUND
   DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1985
   ZONED HISTORIC PRESERVATION: 1994
   NATIONAL REGISTER LISTING: SWAN LAKE 1998; ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION 2009
   CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE: NO
   PREVIOUS ACTIONS:
   COA-EXEMPTION – FEBRUARY 16, 2011 – STAFF APPROVAL
   Removal of chain-link fence and installation of wooden fence in rear and/or side yards

C. ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS
   1. Application of limewash to stone on facades
   2. Construction of addition to porch
   3. Placement of pavement adjacent to addition to porch
   4. Construction of pergola in front of garage
   5. Replacement of driveway
   6. Construction of frame around doorway on east facade
   7. Construction of pergola on deck
   8. Replacement of deck
i. Upon receipt of a Letter of Notification of the requirement for an Historic Preservation Permit, the applicants promptly responded with the submission of an application. Proposed is the approval of projects which have been nearly or fully completed. As noted in their application, the objective of several projects was alteration of the appearance, which reflected the tastes popular in the period of construction. Limewash has been applied to the facades, which were “orange-brown”, according to the applicants, and paint, which is cream or dark bronze in color, will be applied to the surfaces previously colored beige and brown. Other alterations were prompted by a desire for convenience or for the improvement of appearance. To provide additional shelter at the entry of the residence, the roof above the porch has been extended. The planter above the entry to the garage was removed, and, as the area suffered from disrepair according to the applicants, the feature described as a pergola was added. Replacement of the driveway was completed to provide a surface easier for elderly parents to navigate, and replacement of the deck was necessary as the deck previously in the yard had become damaged.

During the review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee on March 16, the discussion focused on the replacement of the deck, the construction of the frame around the doorway on the east facade, and the construction of a feature adjacent to the addition to the porch described as the sitting area, and the latter two items have been added to the agenda for their review. The application has been forwarded with a recommendation for approval with the condition that the proposals for the deck and the pavement of the driveway and sitting area comply with the requirements for open space stipulated in the Zoning Code. After the review, the applicants submitted documentation for the feature described as a pergola on the deck and requested its review by the Tulsa Preservation Commission.


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.2 Exterior Walls
A.2.5 In order to maintain the historic appearance of the structure, do not apply paint to unpainted brick or stone walls. Staff can approve the removal of paint from brick or stone surfaces to return the structure to its original historic appearance. Repainting previously painted surfaces does not require HP Permit review.

SECTION B – GUIDELINES FOR ADDITIONS TO EXISTING STRUCTURES

B.1 General Requirements
B.1.1 Locate additions on the side or rear of your home where the character-defining elements and visual appearance of the front façade will not be obscured, damaged, or destroyed.
B.1.2 Ensure that additions do not detract from the historic appearance, character-defining elements, historic patterns, scale and proportions of the existing structure.
B.1.3 Provide consistency and continuity between the addition and the historic portions of your home by using similar materials, style, forms, massing and scale.
B.1.4 Do not exceed the established height of structures along the same street.
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.6 Garages
B.6.1 Locate garages within the rear yard and detached from the primary residential structure. Detached buildings or structures, such as garages and sheds, not located in the street yard, as defined in the Zoning Code, are exempt from HP Permit review.

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.

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.1.2 Removal of historic landscape features will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Removal of non-historic landscape features can be staff-approved.
G.1.3 Ensure that new landscape features are appropriate to the style of your home and consistent with the historic elements found along the same street and within the district.

G.2 Paving
G.2.1 Retain and preserve original historic paving, steps, and bulkheads through repair
G.2.2 Ensure that the design of new paving is consistent with historic elements found along the same street and within the same neighborhood.
G.2.3 Use paving materials that are consistent with the historic paving found along the same street and within the same neighborhood. Asphalt and stained concrete are not allowed.
East Facade – 1523 East 19th Street – 1995

East Facade – 1523 East 19th Street – 2021

Proposed Location
Pergola
Proposal – Pergola on Deck

Deck – 1523 East 19th Street – 2021
HP PERMIT NUMBER: HP-0256-2021

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1110 EAST 20th STREET

DISTRICT: NORTH MAPLE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

APPLICANTS: STACEY R. AND ERIC B. WOOLLEY

REPRESENTATIVE: NONE

A. CASE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION
   1. Construction of wall
   2. Replacement of bulkheads
   3. Replacement of walkway
   4. Installation of fixtures at entrance to walkway
   5. Removal of walkway between driveway and residence

B. BACKGROUND
   DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1920
   ZONED HISTORIC PRESERVATION: 1993: ORDINANCE AMENDMENT 2005
   NATIONAL REGISTER LISTING: MAPLE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT: 1983
   CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE: NO
   PREVIOUS ACTIONS:
   COA – SEPTEMBER 2, 1997 – TPC APPROVAL
   Installation of rail on steps of porch
   
   COA – JUNE 2, 1998 – TPC APPROVAL
   Installation of tiles on floor of porch
   
   COA – DECEMBER 13, 2001 – TPC APPROVAL
   Installation of wrought-iron fence in front yard with condition that height not exceed four feet (4’-0”)
   
   COA-2008-08-14 – AUGUST 14, 2008 – TPC APPROVAL
   Demolition of attached garage and construction of two-story addition
   
   Replacement of windows with Andersen EnduraClad windows
   
   COA-14-013 – MAY 27, 2014 – TPC APPROVAL
   Construction of addition at rear of residence
C. ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

1. Construction of wall
2. Replacement of bulkheads
3. Replacement of walkway
4. Installation of fixtures at entrance to walkway
5. Removal of walkway between driveway and residence
   i. Proposed are the removal of the wrought-iron fence and the bulkheads adjacent to the sidewalk and their replacement with a wall constructed with masonry which would match the masonry on the residence. Two fixtures for the illumination of the walkway would be installed on the columns adjacent to the walkway. The walkway and the bulkheads which flank the steps for the porch would be replaced with the same material and with the same dimensions, but the walkway between the driveway and the residence would be removed. During the review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee on March 16, discussion focused on the replacement of the walkway and bulkheads near the sidewalk. The retention of the present width of the walkway was recommended, and a Site Plan with the dimensions of the new bulkheads was requested. 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 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.

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

G.1 Landscape Features
G.1.1 Retain and preserve original historic walls, fencing, lighting, planters, and other landscape features through repair.
G.1.3 Ensure that new landscape features are appropriate to the style of your home and consistent with the historic elements found along the same street and within the district.
G.1.5 Use wall materials that are consistent with the historic walls found along the same street and within the district. Cinder block, segmental retaining wall systems, corrugated metal, and railroad ties are not allowed. Historically styled cast concrete block will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
   .1 Elmwood – dry-stack retaining walls are not allowed
North Facade – 1110 East 20th Street

Proposal
Proposal – Indication of Height of Wall

Example
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SPECIFICATIONS</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finish</strong></td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shade</strong></td>
<td>Clear Beveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shade Material</strong></td>
<td>Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensions</strong></td>
<td>21.5&quot;h x 10&quot;w x 10&quot;l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lights</strong></td>
<td>3 x 60 Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulb Type</strong></td>
<td>Incandescent-Candelabra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulbs Included</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimmable</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frame Material</strong></td>
<td>Stainless Steel + Aluminium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>