



## TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

### REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, August 12, 2021, 11:00 A.M.  
City Hall @ One Technology Center, 175 East 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 11:16 A.M.

#### **Members Present**

Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D., Chair  
Holly Becker  
Chris J. Bumgarner  
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS  
Katelyn C. Parker, RA  
Ted A. Reeds, II, AIA\*  
Mark D. G. Sanders\*  
Robert L. Shears, ASLA

#### **Members Absent**

James E. Turner, AIA, Vice-Chair  
Susan J. McKee, MFA, Secretary

#### **Staff Present**

Audrey D. Blank, Roy M. (Jed) Porter, Jr., Felicity Good

#### **Others Present**

Shari Tidwell, Ken Myers, Fernando Lafon, Austin T. Broach, Keith A. Martin,  
Amanda Howell, Cody Wright

\*Late Arrival

2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, July 27, 2021  
Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the Minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bumgarner and approved unanimously.

**Vote:** Minutes – Regular Meeting, July 27, 2021

#### **In Favor**

1. Townsend
2. Becker
3. Bumgarner
4. Grant
5. Parker

#### **Opposed**

#### **Abstaining**

Shears

#### **Not Present**

Turner  
McKee  
Reeds  
Sanders

3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest  
None

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0293-2021 / 1104 N. Cheyenne Ave.** (Brady Heights)

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 5, 2021*

Applicant: Lafon Construction

Proposal:

1. Replacement of door

Staff presented its report, noting that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had forwarded the application without a recommendation for approval or denial. The applicant stated that the former door was plastic and that the new door had already been installed and would be painted. Commissioner Townsend inquired about the material of the new door, and the applicant replied that it was wood. Upon inquiries from Commissioner Shears, the applicant stated that damage to the bottom of the door had been repaired and the hardware from the former door had been installed. Commissioner Grant inquired whether any photographs of the original door existed, and staff replied that the door was not visible in photographs of the residence. The applicant referred to several doors throughout the Brady Heights Historic District that had glass panes and noted that he had located a photograph of a Craftsman Style residence with a similar front door on-line. Commissioner Parker commented that, although several doors in the Brady Heights Historic District have glass panes, the muntins on the door proposed as a replacement did not match the muntins on the windows. The applicant replied that, although he would have preferred a door that more closely matched the windows, the cost of a custom-made door was too high. Commissioner Parker acknowledged the financial considerations but emphasized that the Unified Design Guidelines should be the basis of approval. The applicant offered the alternative solution of installation of the former door, but Commissioner Parker stated that this door was preferable. Commissioner Townsend agreed that the applicant could keep the former door on the residence, as existing non-historic elements are allowed to remain, but Commissioner Sanders disagreed and noted that it may have been an unapproved feature. Upon a request for clarification from Commissioner Bumgarner, the applicant stated that the proposal was submitted for the door only, not its hardware. The applicant then commented on the extensive work that he had undertaken to repair and replace elements on the residence, and Commissioner Townsend expressed gratitude to the applicant for the accomplishments.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Bumgarner made a motion to approve the application with the note that selection of new hardware would require an application for an Historic Preservation Permit. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and approved with a majority.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.3.1, A.3.5

**Vote: 1104 N. Cheyenne Ave. (Brady Heights)**

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

2. **HP-0295-2021 / 715 N. Denver Ave.** (Brady Heights)  
*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 5, 2021*  
 Applicant: Austin T. Broach  
 Proposal:  
 1. Replacement of walls

Staff presented its report, noting that the weight of the stucco had affected the foundation of the residence and that an engineer had recommended the stucco be removed. Commissioner Reeds reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had considered several treatments of the facade, including the repair and replacement in kind of the cedar siding that remained under the stucco but ultimately found that the stucco was integral to the character of the residence and had recommended approval with the condition that the west facade be retained and that an Exterior Insulation and Finishing System (EIFS) be applied on the other facades. Commissioner Reeds added that, although he would not usually encourage the use EIFS, several factors, such as the presence of siding behind the stucco and the desire for additional insulation, made it a viable alternative to stucco in this case. Commissioner Bumgarner inquired about the joints, and Commissioner Reeds noted that they would be placed on the sides of the residence. Commissioner Bumgarner emphasized that the placement of joints should be minimal. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Parker, the applicant confirmed that siding was present behind the stucco. Commissioner Reeds commented further on issues caused by the weight of the stucco and noted that EIFS would be lighter.

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

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.2.1, A.2.2, A.2.3

**Vote:** 715 N. Denver Ave. (Brady Heights)

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

3. **HP-0301-2021 / 1332 E. 18<sup>th</sup> St.** (Swan Lake)  
*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 5, 2021*  
 Applicants: Sasha A. and Keith A. Martin  
 Proposal:  
 1. Construction of wall

Staff presented its report, noting that the wall had significantly deteriorated and caused concerns about safety. Commissioner Reeds reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee carefully reviewed several proposals for the replacement of the wall and recommended approval of the application with the condition that the height be reduced by at least one course at the corner.

Discussion then focused on the selection of Redi-Rock as a material. Commissioner Reeds stated that, although native stone would have been preferable, the applicants selected Redi-Rock because of its price. Staff added that the Product Data for the fence had not been provided, so the proposal for the fence would be reviewed by the Tulsa Preservation Commission at a future Regular Meeting. Commissioner Reeds inquired about a sample of the material, and staff responded that the applicant had provided photographs of the material but was unable to provide a physical sample of Redi-Rock due to its weight. Commissioner Parker noted that segmental retaining wall systems are prohibited by the Unified Design Guidelines, and Commissioner Shears agreed, emphasizing that the size of the stones created an appearance that is inappropriate for an historic neighborhood. Commissioner Townsend inquired whether the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had addressed this issue in their discussion of the proposal, and Commissioner Reeds answered affirmatively but noted that, due to the urgency of the wall's replacement and the lack of feasibility of other alternatives, the subcommittee found Redi-Rock to be acceptable. Commissioner Parker noted that, although concrete would be an historically appropriate material, Redi-Rock would be preferable. Commissioner Sanders inquired whether Redi-Rock was a segmental retaining wall system and noted that the Unified Design Guidelines would allow historically styled cast concrete blocks on a case-by-case basis. Commissioner Shears confirmed that it was a segmental retaining wall system and commented that a wall made of split-face concrete masonry units connected with mortar would be acceptable. Commissioner Parker commented that the Redi-Rock mimicked the texture of stone and blended several sizes, like rock-face block. Staff noted that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee did consider the mixture of sizes and shapes of Redi-Rock during its review of the application. Commissioner Shears emphasized the prohibition of segmental retaining wall systems in the Unified Design Guidelines and, when asked to suggest an alternative by Commissioner Townsend, stated that a split-face block wall would be acceptable. Commissioner Sanders requested clarification about the reason that a split-face concrete block wall would be preferable, and Commissioner Shears stated that the difference was aesthetic. Commissioner Sanders questioned the difference in the quality of materials, and Commissioner Shears emphasized that Redi-Rock would not present the appearance of a rock wall. Commissioner Bumgarner agreed that size of each Redi-Rock unit would be larger than a typical rock or concrete block and that the joints between each unit were apparent and inquired whether any alternative materials had been considered. The applicant and commissioners discussed several alternatives, and the applicant stated that other treatments, such as a concrete retaining wall and a set of two smaller walls with terraces, would be significantly more expensive. Commissioner Parker speculated whether the yard had originally been sloped between the residence and the sidewalk but concluded it likely had not been sloped, and Commissioner Shears inquired whether it would be possible to reduce the wall's height by half and adjust the grade of the yard. The applicant responded that the slope of the yard would be significant were the height of the wall reduced to that extent. Commissioner Townsend then summarized the scenarios which had been discussed. Commissioner Parker expressed acceptance of the proposal, stating that, despite the prohibition of segmental retaining wall systems by the Unified Design Guidelines, the Redi-Rock seemed to be the best alternative in this specific case and noted that the Redi-Rock would resemble rock-face block and would be preferable to a plain concrete wall.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Parker made a motion to approve the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sanders and was approved with a majority.

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

**Vote: 1332 E. 18<sup>th</sup> St. (Swan Lake)**

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

4. **HP-0296-2021 / 2211 E. 20<sup>th</sup> St. (Yorktown)**

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 5, 2021*

Applicant: Shari Tidwell

Proposal:

1. Replacement of windows

Staff presented its report, noting the availability of a sample in the South Conference Room. Commissioner Reeds reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee recommended approval of the vinyl windows because the dimensions of the muntins matched those of the original wood windows. Staff added that the window frames and sills would be repaired and replaced in kind. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Parker, Ken Myers, the applicant's representative, contended that the windows would be replaced because they were damaged beyond repair. Commissioner Parker requested additional information about the extent of each window's replacement, and Mr. Myers stated that custom-made, single-hung sash replacement windows would be installed. Mr. Myers emphasized that the muntins would have the same dimensions as the windows presently on the residence and clarified that the windows included jambs and would be placed within the frame. Commissioner Parker expressed disapproval of the replacement of the windows and argued that the original wood windows have a significantly longer lifespan than vinyl windows and could be repaired for nearly the same cost as replacement with vinyl windows. The applicant expressed satisfaction with the quality of the windows selected, and Commissioner Parker emphasized that the removal of the original windows could not be reversed. Commissioner Reeds recalled that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had discussed the selection of aluminum-clad wooden windows but concluded that the lifespan was comparable to that of the windows proposed as replacements. Commissioner Parker noted that failure in the seal between the glass and the jamb was a common problem with vinyl windows and would necessitate the replacement of the entire window. Commissioner Townsend inquired whether the applicant had pursued the repair of the original windows. The applicant stated that she had received several bids for the repair of the windows and commented on the extent of the damage, which made the repair of the windows infeasible. Fernando Lafon, owner of Lafon Construction, described his recent project to repair twenty-one (21) windows on the residence located at 1104 North Cheyenne Avenue. Commissioner Parker added that repair of the wooden windows would be cost effective because they would last much longer than vinyl windows. Commissioner Sanders agreed and commented on the repair of windows at his own residence in the North Maple Ridge Historic Overlay District, adding that he could not support the proposal if repair and replacement in kind was a viable alternative.

Commissioner Sanders made a motion to deny the application, and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker. Staff then suggested the extension of the period of review to allow the applicants to explore further the repair of the original windows. Mr. Myers inquired whether wooden sash replacement windows would be acceptable, and Commissioner Parker commented on the differences between replacement of the sash of a window and installation of sash replacement windows, noting that material was not her only concern with the proposal. Commissioner Grant stated that he would be willing to consider the replacement of the windows with a sash replacement system made from wood. Commissioner Sanders withdrew his motion with agreement from Commissioner Parker, and the applicant agreed to extend the period of review and further explore the repair of the windows.

5. **HP-0298-2021 / 1827 E. 16<sup>th</sup> Pl.** (Yorktown)

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 5, 2021*

Applicant: Atlas Homes LLC

Proposal:

1. Replacement of ties with wall
2. Construction of walkway and steps
3. Installation of windows in gables

Staff presented its report, noting that the applicant had withdrawn Item 3: Installation of windows in gables. Commissioner Reeds reported that the retaining wall would be constructed from concrete masonry units with a stone veneer and that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had recommended approval of the application. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Parker, the applicant stated that the installation of the windows in the gables may be submitted for consideration at a future Regular Meeting of the Tulsa Preservation Commission. Commissioner Sanders inquired about the columns, and staff replied that their replacement was no longer proposed.

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

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.4.7, A.6.1, A.6.2, A.6.3, G.1.1, G.1.2, G.1.3, G.1.5, G.2.1, G.2.2, G.2.3

**Vote:** 1827 E. 16<sup>th</sup> Pl. (Yorktown)

**In Favor**

1. Townsend
2. Becker
3. Bumgarner
4. Grant
5. Parker
6. Reeds
7. Sanders
8. Shears

**Opposed**

**Abstaining**

**Not Present**

Turner  
McKee

6. **HP-0300-2021 / 1607 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)**

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 5, 2021*

Applicant: Terra Nova Properties

Proposal:

1. Adjustment of locations of dormers\*

*\*Alteration of Approved Proposal*

Staff presented its report, noting that the dormers had been shifted to align vertically with the windows and entry and that the other alterations to the Approved Proposal would be completed as approved or resubmitted for consideration at a future Regular Meeting of the Tulsa Preservation Commission. Commissioner Reeds reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had accepted the adjustment of the locations of the dormers but had several concerns about the alterations to the porch. Commissioner Sanders inquired about the reason for the submittal of the adjustment of the locations of the dormers separately from the other alterations to the Approved Proposal, and staff explained that the period of performance did not expire until September 13, 2021, and that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had directed staff to contact the applicant and request that the columns on the porch reflect the Approved Proposal. Commissioner Parker indicated acceptance of the location of the dormers but observed that the eaves did not have the same extension as those previously approved. Commissioner Townsend suggested that staff should convey these concerns to the applicant. Staff offered several possible actions that the Tulsa Preservation Commission could pursue.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the eaves of the dormers be extended to match the length originally approved. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker and approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, B.1.1, B.1.2, B.1.3, B.1.4, B.2.1, B.2.2, B.3.1, B.3.2, B.3.3, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4

**Vote:** 1607 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)

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

7. **HP-0294-2021 / 1837 E. 17<sup>th</sup> PI. (Yorktown)**

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 5, 2021*

Applicant: Justin L. Griffith

Proposal:

1. Replacement of door

Staff presented its report, noting that the applicant had not responded to staff's request for Product Data for the hardware. Commissioner Reeds reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had recommended approval of Proposal

One. Staff added that the residence was an example of the Tudor Revival Style. Commissioner Sanders agreed that Proposal One was preferable but inquired about the reason for replacement of the door. As the applicant was not present, staff replied that the applicant had cited damage to the door and rotten wood as the reasons for its replacement. Commissioner Sanders expressed a need to explore the repair of the door if it is original, and Commissioner Parker deemed the application incomplete. Staff agreed to request an image of the door presently on the residence, a detailed representation of the damage, and Product Data for the hardware. Commissioner Grant inquired whether the frame would be replaced as well, and staff offered to contact the applicant. Commissioner Sanders expressed a concern that the period of review would expire, but Commissioner Parker noted that the period of review only begins upon receipt of a complete application.

C. Reports

1. Chair Report

Commissioner Townsend requested that commissioners promptly respond to staff's request for verification of quorum and arrive at Regular Meetings promptly as well. Staff requested that commissioners refrain from sudden cancellations when possible.

2. Staff Report

Staff reported that the residence located at 1539 South Gillette Avenue had been damaged in a fire on July 30. The roof had collapsed, but the residence had been unoccupied when the fire began. Staff reported on Work completed at 1868 East 16<sup>th</sup> Place.

D. New Business

Commissioner Grant announced that a steel ramp had been constructed on the porch at the residence located at 1110 East 18<sup>th</sup> Street. Staff will investigate the Work completed without an Historic Preservation Permit.

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

None

F. Public Comment

None

G. Adjournment

Commissioner Townsend adjourned the Regular Meeting at 12:46 P.M.