



TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, March 23, 2021, 4:30 P.M.

City Hall @ One Technology Center, 175 East 2nd Street
10th Floor - South Conference Room

A. Opening Matters

1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum

Commissioner Townsend called the Regular Meeting to order at 4:39 P.M.

Members Present

Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D., Chair²
Holly M. Becker¹
Chris J. Bumgarner^{1, 4}
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS²
Susan J. McKee, MFA¹
Katelyn C. Parker, RA¹
Ted A. Reeds, II, AIA²
Mark D. G. Sanders¹

Members Absent

James E. Turner, AIA, Vice-Chair
Robert L. Shears, ASLA

Staff Present

Audrey D. Blank¹, Roy M. (Jed) Porter, Jr.², Felicity O. Good²

Others Present

Christopher C. S. Manning¹, Ginger Sexton¹, Daniel S. Hildebrand¹, Jacqueline Bowman¹, Juli Williams¹, Lucky Lamons¹, R. H. ¹, Susan White¹, Valerie O'Brien¹, Andrew C. Jayne¹, Pam Crandall¹, David C. Hoffer¹, Eric B. Woolley¹, Matthew D. McAfee¹, Elissa Baker¹, Mike Keys¹

¹ Participation via Remote Access

² Attendance in South Conference Room

³ Late Arrival

⁴ Early Departure

2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, March 11, 2021

Commissioner Reeds made a motion to approve the Minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and approved unanimously.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, March 11, 2021

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend			Turner
2. Becker			Shears
3. Bumgarner			
4. Grant			
5. McKee			
6. Parker			
7. Reeds			
8. Sanders			

3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
No Conflicts of Interest were disclosed.

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0253-2021 / 1624 S. Madison Ave.** (North Maple Ridge)
Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: March 16, 2021
Applicant: Daniel S. Hildebrand
Proposal:
 1. Removal of chimney

Upon a request from Commissioner Sanders, Staff reported the names of the commissioners present in the South Conference Room and online via GoToMeeting and indicated that the discussion on the procedure for applications for demolition would occur after the review of Actionable Items by the Tulsa Preservation Commission.

Staff presented its report, noting that the chimney previously served the flue, which is no longer in use. Commissioner Becker reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had inquired whether the chimney stack could be removed below the roof line but retained above it and, after determination that the treatment was not feasible, had recommended the approval of the application. Commissioner Sanders expressed approval of the proposal and commented that the removal of the chimney would not significantly impact the character of the residence.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.5.1, A.5.2, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4

Vote: 1624 S. Madison Ave. (North Maple Ridge)

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend			Turner
2. Becker			Shears
3. Bumgarner			
4. Grant			
5. McKee			
6. Parker			
7. Reeds			
8. Sanders			

2. **HP-0255-2021 / 1501 S. Norfolk Ave.** (North Maple Ridge)
Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: March 16, 2021
 Applicant: David C. Hoffer
 Proposal:
 1. Replacement of fence

Staff presented its report, noting the proposed placement of a gate on the east side of the fence. Commissioner Becker reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee forwarded the application with a recommendation for approval. The applicant added that the gate was intended to provide access to his containers for garbage and recycled materials, which would be concealed by the fence.

As there was no discussion, Commissioner Reeds made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and was approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4, G.1.1, G.1.3, G.1.4

Vote: 1501 S. Norfolk Ave. (North Maple Ridge)

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend			Turner
2. Becker			Shears
3. Bumgarner			
4. Grant			
5. McKee			
6. Parker			
7. Reeds			
8. Sanders			

3. **HP-0257-2021 / 1591 Swan Dr.** (Swan Lake)
Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: March 16, 2021
 Applicant: Christopher C. S. Manning
 Proposal:
 1. Replacement of terrace
Project initiated without an Historic Preservation Permit

Staff presented its report, noting the owner's prompt response to the Letter of Notification, and that, since the terrace maintained its previous footprint and no buildings, driveways, or parking areas had been added, the total open space on the lot likely had not changed. Commissioner Becker reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had expressed concerns about the minimum open space required by the Tulsa Zoning Code but had forwarded the application with a recommendation of approval with the condition that the amount of pavement complied with the open space requirements of the Zoning Code. The applicant apologized to the commission for failing to secure a Historic Preservation Permit prior to the initiation of the project.

As there was no discussion, Commissioner Reeds made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Becker and was approved with a majority.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4, G.1.1, G.1.2, G.1.3

Vote: 1591 Swan Dr. (North Maple Ridge)

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend	Grant		Turner
2. Becker	McKee		Shears
3. Bumgarner			
4. Parker			
5. Reeds			
6. Sanders			

4. **HP-0254-2021 / 1523 E. 19th St.** (Swan Lake)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: March 16, 2021

Applicants: Jodi F. and Andrew C. Jayne

Proposals:

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

Staff presented its report, noting the owners' prompt response to the Letter of Notification and their expressed desire for the residence to be compatible with the neighborhood. Commissioner Becker reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee's questions had been answered, and the application had been forwarded with a recommendation of approval with the condition that the open space requirement of the Zoning Code be satisfied. The applicant apologized to the commission for failing to secure a Historic Preservation Permit prior to the initiation of the project and noted that the flagstone on the west side of the porch had been replaced by concrete due to the roots of the tree. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Townsend, the applicant clarified the location of the pavement adjacent to the addition to the porch. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner McKee, the applicant stated that the cedar on the porch and pergola would be stained to match the trim elsewhere on the residence. Commissioner Reeds observed the large amount of impermeable surface on the west side of the residence and expressed concern about the site's compliance with zoning regulations. Commissioner Grant inquired whether a Building Permit was sought for the project, and the applicant stated that their contractor had indicated that a Building Permit was not required. Commissioner Grant disagreed, noting that permits would be required for the structure over the porch, the driveway, and the replacement of the deck. Staff clarified that an Historic Preservation Permit would be required in order for the applicant to proceed with an application for a Building Permit. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Sanders, the applicant explained that previously a planter box had been present above the door to the garage and that the pergola was intended to fill the now empty space above the door. Commissioner Sanders noted that the ends of the beam on the pergola were tapered rather than square as shown in the drawings. Commissioner Sanders expressed appreciation for the attempt to fit the residence into the neighborhood but questioned whether the proposed treatments had

been well executed. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Townsend, Commissioner Reeds stated that the dimensions of the gable over the porch appeared proportional to the residence.

Commissioner Reeds expressed disapproval of the application, citing concerns about issues related to zoning that could arise during the review for the Building Permit and noting that an extensive amount of concrete had been added to the yard on the west side of the lot. Commissioner Reeds made a motion to deny the application. Commissioner Grant inquired whether a Building Permit could be a condition of approval, and Staff indicated that a Building Permit from the City of Tulsa would be required for the Work, regardless of the condition. Staff suggested that the commission consider a separate vote on each item and recommended the applicant confirm compliance with the open space requirement of the Zoning Code. Legal Staff noted that Items 2 and 3 seemed to be the two items in question. Commissioner Reeds amended his motion to approve Items 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and to recommend that the applicant acquire permits from the City of Tulsa for Items 2 and 3. Staff inquired whether the staff of the Permit Center could confirm whether the minimum required open space was present, and Legal Staff replied that the Permit Center would only make the determination upon the receipt of a complete application. Staff noted that an Historic Preservation Permit would be required before the applicant could apply for a Building Permit, and any changes to the proposal after approval must be approved by the Tulsa Preservation Commission. Commissioner Reeds withdrew his motion, and several possible scenarios for approval and denial of the application were then discussed.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Parker made a motion to approve Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and to deny Item 3. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sanders and was approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.2.5, B.1.1, B.1.2, B.1.3, B.1.4, B.5.1, B.6.1, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4, G.1.1, G.1.2, G.1.3, G.2.1, G.2.2, G.2.3

Vote: 1523 E. 19th St. (Swan Lake)

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend			Turner
2. Becker			Bumgarner
3. Grant			Shears
4. McKee			
5. Parker			
6. Reeds			
7. Sanders			

5. HP-0256-2021 / 1110 E. 20th St. (North Maple Ridge)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: March 16, 2021

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

Staff presented its report, sharing photographs of the site provided by the applicant. Commissioner Becker reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee regarded the retaining wall as an improvement of the property and recommended approval of the application. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Townsend, Staff indicated the proposed location of the light fixtures. Commissioner Grant inquired about the construction of the wall, and the applicant stated that the wall would have a concrete footing and would be clad in masonry. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Parker, the applicant stated that the wall would be twenty-seven-and-a-half inches (27-1/2") at its tallest point and would function as a retaining wall.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Reeds made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker and approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4, G.1.1, G.1.3, G.1.5

Vote: 1110 E. 20th St. (North Maple Ridge)

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend			Turner
2. Becker			Bumgarner
3. Grant			Shears
4. McKee			
5. Parker			
6. Reeds			
7. Sanders			

6. Application – Funds for Certified Local Government Program – Fiscal Year 2021-22

Staff presented the draft of the application for the use of Certified Local Government Funds for Fiscal Year 2021-22 and noted that the application could be amended if additional funds became available or if circumstances arise.

Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the Application – Funds for the Certified Local Government Program for Fiscal Year 2021-22. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and was approved unanimously.

Vote: Application – Funds for Certified Local Government Program – Fiscal Year 2021-22

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Townsend			Turner
2. Becker			Bumgarner
3. Grant			Shears
4. McKee			
5. Parker			
6. Reeds			
7. Sanders			

C. Discussion – Procedure for Review of Applications for Historic Preservation Permits for Demolition

Commissioner Townsend framed the discussion, posing the question of whether applications for demolition should first be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee prior to review by the Tulsa Preservation Commission.

Pam Gotcher, 3025 South Quaker Avenue, expressed her approval of the proposal and commented that incorporating an additional week into the process would allow neighbors time to explore alternatives to demolition, which would be favorable to the neighborhood. Elissa Baker, 1711 South Yorktown Avenue, stated that any intervention which would assist neighbors in seeking alternatives to demolition would aid the maintenance of the integrity of historic districts and protect the value of property. Ms. Baker observed that demolition is most impactful for neighbors in historic districts. Valerie O'Brien, 2136 East 17th Place, commented that adding a review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee would be logical and expressed the desire for the Ad Hoc Committee on Process to search for avenues to make the process for the applications for demolition more complex. Upon a request for clarification from Commissioner Grant, Commissioner Townsend explained the roles of the Ad Hoc Committee on Process and the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. Matthew D. McAfee, Neighborhood Representative for the Yorktown Historic Preservation Overlay District, announced that neighbors with whom he has spoken have expressed a desire to receive as much notice as possible of applications for demolition and to incorporate the review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee as an additional opportunity for residents to voice their opinions.

Commissioner Reeds inquired whether it is possible to route applications for demolition to the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee, and Legal Staff offered to review the Tulsa Preservation Commission's Rules and Regulations. Neighborhood Representative McAfee observed that other applications must be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee before being forwarded to the Tulsa Preservation Commission, but Commissioner Townsend responded that not all applications require a review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. Staff noted that proposals with a modest Scope of Work have been forwarded directly to the Tulsa Preservation Commission without review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. Commissioner Sanders stated that he found demolition to be antithetical to preservation and would like to see demolitions delayed as long as possible. Commissioner Sanders noted that adding a review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee did not delay the demolition by one week, as the Tulsa Preservation Commission must act on a proposal of demolition within thirty (30) days of the receipt of a complete application. Commissioner Townsend replied that including a review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee would serve as an opportunity for full participation by Neighborhood Representatives of each district. Upon a request for clarification by Commissioner Townsend, Staff stated that the two advantages to review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee are that neighbors would be aware of the application a week prior to the Tulsa Preservation Commission's review and that each Neighborhood Representative would have a formal voice during the review by the subcommittee. Legal Staff, after reviewing the Rules and Regulations of the Tulsa Preservation Commission, concluded that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee could review "complex projects." Commissioner Townsend commented that, while applicants are invited to the Regular Meetings of the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee, they are not required to be present. Commissioner Grant expressed support of the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee's review of applications for demolition, expressing the advantage of the subcommittee providing a formal recommendation to the Tulsa

Preservation Commission and of allowing neighbors the ability to participate further in the process.

D. Reports

1. Chair Report

None

2. Staff Report

None

E. New Business

None

F. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

Staff announced that the next Regular Meeting of the Tulsa Preservation Commission will include a Public Information Session as required for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

G. Public Comment

Mr. McAfee inquired when the Ad Hoc Committee on Process would convene, and Commissioner Grant replied that the committee would schedule a meeting within the next thirty (30) days.

H. Adjournment

Commissioner Townsend adjourned the Regular Meeting at 6:22 P.M.