



## TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, June 22, 2021, 4:30 P.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 4:30 P.M.

#### **Members Present**

Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D., Chair  
Susan J. McKee, MFA, Secretary  
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS  
Katelyn C. Parker, RA  
Ted A. Reeds, II, AIA  
Robert L. Shears, ASLA

#### **Members Absent**

James E. Turner, AIA, Vice-Chair  
Holly Becker  
Chris J. Bumgarner  
Jillian Ihloff  
Mark D. G. Sanders

#### **Staff Present**

Audrey D. Blank, Roy M. (Jed) Porter, Jr., Felicity Good, Travis Hulse, Nathan Foster, Amy Ulmer

#### **Others Present**

Lesli E. Augsburg, Stephen W. Smith

2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, June 10, 2021  
Commissioner Reeds made a motion to approve the Minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Shears and approved with a majority.

**Vote:** Minutes – Regular Meeting, June 10, 2021

#### **In Favor**

1. Townsend
2. McKee
3. Parker
4. Reeds
5. Shears

#### **Opposed**

#### **Abstaining**

Grant

#### **Not Present**

Turner  
Becker  
Bumgarner  
Ihloff  
Sanders

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

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0284-2021 / 1131 E. 18<sup>th</sup> St.** (North Maple Ridge)

Applicant: Lesli E. Augsburger

Proposals:

1. Installation of fixtures on east side of residence
2. Installation of masonry on walls
3. Reconstruction of columns at entry to driveway

Staff presented its report, noting that the previously approved project was not executed by the former owner and that the period of performance had expired. The applicant shared samples of the masonry and noted that some original bricks had been retained and would be blended with the new masonry. Commissioner Grant noted that the predominant color on the residence was beige, and the applicant commented that the blend of colors in the masonry would mimic that of the residence, walls, and columns. Commissioner Parker inquired about the texture of the masonry, and the applicant confirmed that the texture would match that of the original masonry. Commissioners Parker, Grant, and McKee noted that the red brick did not appear to match other colors on the residence, and the applicant shared additional photographs of the residence. Commissioner Shears expressed approval of the selection, citing the applicant's extensive research, and Commissioners Reeds and Parker agreed. Commissioner Shears inquired about the stucco on the wall, and the applicant stated that the wall had been constructed with concrete block surrounded by Styrofoam and stucco, adding that the Styrofoam layer would be removed before the masonry would be added to the surface. Commissioner Grant inquired whether the mortar would be tinted to match the original mortar, and the applicant answered affirmatively. Commissioner Townsend then directed discussion to the replacement of the fixture. Upon inquiries from Commissioners Parker and Shears, the applicant stated that she was unsure whether the fixture was original and that no other original fixtures had been retained. Commissioner Grant speculated that the fixture did not appear to be original, and Commissioner Parker agreed. Commissioner Parker stated her preference for Option One, the fixture manufactured by Hinkley, and Commissioner Reeds observed that its scale would be appropriate for the residence. The applicant indicated a preference for the fixture to be black, and the commissioners agreed. Commissioner Shears recommended that the columns on both sides of the driveway be the same size, and the applicant explained that the new columns would be reconstructed with dimensions matching those of the original columns. Commissioner Grant indicated a preference for the pattern of the masonry on the columns to match that of the residence and inquired about the construction of the column. The applicant stated that she was not aware of the material in the core of the column, but Commissioner Parker speculated that the column was probably hollow. Commissioner Shears observed that a wall had been removed and the column inserted when the driveway was relocated from its entry on Owasso Avenue to its current location on 18<sup>th</sup> Street. Commissioner Reeds indicated approval of the bond on the existing column, and Commissioner Shears stated that the pattern should match the other columns on the site. The applicant shared photographs of other columns, and Commissioner Grant stated that the masonry should match that on the original wall. Commissioner Reeds recommended the addition of a soldier course to the top of each column and inquired about the caps. The applicant stated that the caps would match those on the original columns.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Reeds made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions—

- that the Hinkley Trafalgar fixture with a black finish shown in the Staff Report be installed,
- that the courses of masonry on the walls match the courses on the existing wall,
- that the masonry on the walls and columns match the blend of colors of the masonry and mortar on the residence and the original wall and columns as closely as possible, and
- that the pattern of masonry on the columns match the pattern on the original columns with a soldier course included as the top course.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker and was approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.7.4, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4, G.1.1, G.1.2, G.1.3, G.1.4, G.1.5

**Vote: 1311 E. 18<sup>th</sup> St. (North Maple Ridge)**

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

**2. HP-0285-2021 / 231 E. 18<sup>th</sup> St. (North Maple Ridge)**

Applicant: Stephen W. Smith

Proposals:

1. Reconstruction of columns
2. Reconstruction of balusters and rails
3. Replacement of lattice

Staff presented its report, sharing an image of a painting of the residence, which had inspired the owner to restore the porch to its former appearance. The applicant commented on the repairs previously undertaken on the residence and on the evidence of the former appearance of the porch that the painting had provided and noted that the lattice would be mostly obscured by vegetation and that the composite material would provide longevity that wood would not. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Reeds, the applicant confirmed that the porch had been leveled and that some material had been removed. Commissioner Grant inquired about the columns presently on the porch, and the applicant replied that they were four-by-four (4X4) wood columns. Commissioner Townsend inquired about the proposal for the floor of the porch, and the applicant stated that it would be constructed with five-inch (0'-5") Trex Composite Decking. Commissioner Grant observed that the original porch probably had a four-inch (0'-4") tongue-and-groove wood floor and inquired about the placement of the joists. The applicant replied that the joists were parallel to the facade. Commissioner Grant noted that the appearance of Trex Composite Decking would differ from that of wood tongue-and-groove planks and inquired about the texture. The applicant replied

that the decking would have a texture resembling wood grain. Upon inquiries from Commissioners Reeds and Parker, the applicant stated that the planks would extend perpendicularly to the facade and a piece of trim would be placed to conceal the edge of the floor. Commissioner Parker requested information about the height of the rail, and the applicant expressed a preference for a height of thirty inches (2'-6"). Commissioner Parker expressed her approval of the proposed rail but recommended the selection of a column with an eight-inch (0'-8") diameter. Commissioner Shears expressed concern that the composite material could cause the rail to sag, and the applicant responded that a block would be inserted beneath the bottom rail at the midpoint between each column. Upon a request for clarification from Commissioner Parker, the applicant stated that the column to the right of the front door would match the other columns in all dimensions except height. Commissioner Shears expressed disapproval of the composite material selected for the floor and a preference for a wood tongue-and-groove floor. Commissioner Townsend directed discussion to the replacement of the lattice, and Commissioner Parker recommended placement of the lattice behind the faces of the bases of the columns. Commissioners Parker and Reeds expressed acceptance of the material selected for the lattice, and, upon an inquiry from Commissioner Grant, the applicant stated that the bases would be constructed from split-face concrete blocks. Commissioner Grant requested information about the height of the beam above the columns, and the applicant replied that the beam would be between eight inches (0'-8") and ten inches (0'-10") in height. Commissioner Grant recommended that the caps of the columns be twelve inches (1'-0") wide and that the columns be centered on the caps. Commissioners Reeds, Parker, and Grant briefly discussed the structural capacity of the columns and concluded that the Product Data indicated that they could support the roof of the porch. Commissioner Grant suggested that the floor extend past the bases of the columns. Commissioner Townsend then directed discussion to the floor of the porch, and, after a brief exchange, the applicant agreed to submit an application for an Historic Preservation Permit for the replacement of the floor.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Parker made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions—

- that the columns have a diameter of eight inches (0'-8"),
- that the rail be thirty inches (2'-6") in height with a block inserted below the lower rail at each midpoint between the columns, and
- that the lattice be placed behind the face of the bases of the columns, as shown in the painting included in the Staff Report.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and approved with a majority.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.6.1, A.6.2, A.6.3, A.6.4, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4

**Vote:** 231 E. 18<sup>th</sup> St. (North Maple Ridge)

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

- C. Presentation – Neighborhood Infill Overlay  
Travis Hulse, Nathan Foster, and Amy Ulmer from the Tulsa Planning Office offered a presentation about the amendments to the Tulsa Zoning Code that would establish the Neighborhood Infill Overlay District. The Brady Heights Historic Preservation Overlay District is among the neighborhoods selected for inclusion in the Neighborhood Infill Overlay District. Principal Planner Hulse provided background on the Neighborhood Infill Overlay and summarized the process for its approval. Senior Planner Foster described the city-wide issues addressed in the amendments to the Zoning Code and the regulations that would apply only to the areas selected to be in the Neighborhood Infill Overlay District. After their presentation, Mr. Hulse and Mr. Foster answered questions regarding accessory dwelling units, restrictions on use, and parking.
  
- D. Review – Draft of Agenda for Annual Retreat  
Staff presented the draft of the agenda for the Annual Retreat to be held on June 26, 2021, in the Community Room at 810 South Cincinnati Avenue. No revisions were proposed.
  
- E. Reports
  - 1. Chair Report  
None
  - 2. Staff Report  
None
  
- F. New Business  
None
  
- G. Announcements and Future Agenda Items  
None
  
- H. Public Comment  
None
  
- I. Adjournment  
Commissioner Townsend adjourned the Regular Meeting at 6:01 P.M.