



TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, August 23, 2022, 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 Turner called the Regular Meeting to order at 4:36 P.M.

Members Present

James Turner, AIA, Chair
Holly Becker, Vice-Chair
Royce Ellington
Susan McKee, MFA
Mark Sanders
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.

Members Absent

Katelyn Parker, RA, Secretary
Chris Bumgarner
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS
Ted A. Reeds II, AIA
Robert Shears, ASLA

Staff Present

Audrey Blank, Felicity Good, Robi Jones

Others Present

John Spillyards, Joel Carr, Cassia Carr, Dariela Gonzales, Steven Jones, Kimberly McCoy

*Late Arrival

2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, August 11, 2022

Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting on August 11, 2022. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellington and approved unanimously.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, August 11, 2022

In Favor

1. Turner
2. Becker
3. Ellington
4. McKee
5. Sanders
6. Townsend

Opposed

Abstaining

Not Present

Parker
Bumgarner
Grant
Reeds
Shears

3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

None

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0376-2022 / 1611 S. Troost Ave. (Swan Lake)**

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Dates: July 7, 2022, August 16, 2022

Applicant: Dariela Gonzalez

Proposals:

1. Replacement of rail on porch
2. Replacement of door and hardware

Project completed without an Historic Preservation Permit

Staff directed commissioners' attention to Section 70.070-F of the Tulsa Zoning Code and afterwards presented its report. The applicant was present and had nothing to add to the staff report. Commissioner Turner stated that he was present at the most recent review of the application by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee on August 16, 2022, and that there was not much discussion about the door or hardware. Commissioner Turner reported that the subcommittee focused discussion on the spacing of the balusters on the rail and ultimately recommended approval of the application as proposed. Commissioner Ellington concurred that the balusters were spaced wider than the previous balusters but indicated acceptance of the rail. Commissioner Sanders asked if the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had discussed the painting of the masonry piers on the porch. Commissioner Turner stated that it was not discussed, as the piers had been previously painted, and Commissioner Ellington agreed. Ms. Good stated that the piers appear to be painted in both an image of the residence from Google Street View and the survey photos from 1995. Commissioner Townsend inquired whether an historic preservation (HP) permit would be required to repaint the piers since they were masonry, and Ms. Good stated that in the past the requirement for an HP permit had been applied only to painting previously unpainted surfaces. Commissioner Sanders agreed with Commissioner Townsend's question and inquired whether changing the paint color would be subject to review by the preservation commission. Commissioner Turner stated that the preservation commission did not typically regulate color and had not in the past reviewed the repainting of previously painted masonry. Commissioner Townsend advised the applicant, Dariela Gonzalez, to contact staff in the future before painting any surfaces to ensure that it would not require an HP permit, and Ms. Gonzalez agreed. Commissioner McKee expressed disapproval of the wider spacing of the balusters and objected to the top rail. Commissioner Turner stated that the reconstructed rail appeared to match that shown in the survey photo except for the spacing of the balusters. The applicant, Dariela Gonzalez, explained that she tried to preserve as many elements on the porch as possible and mimic the previous railing. Ms. Gonzalez stated that much of the wood was rotted, and the balusters had been unevenly spaced prior to her purchase of the house. Upon a request for clarification from Commissioner McKee, Ms. Gonzalez confirmed that the entire rail had been replaced, adding that the previous rail was unsafe. Commissioner McKee asked the applicant why the rail was not returned to its previous appearance, and Ms. Gonzalez emphasized that there had been no template for the spacing of the balusters because they had been unevenly spaced. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Townsend, Commissioner Ellington said the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had the same conversation about the spacing of the balusters, and Commissioner Turner stated that the recommendation of approval had not been unanimous.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Ellington made a motion to approve both items in the proposal as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sanders. The motion failed due to a lack of majority. Commissioner

Sanders clarified that his vote in favor of the application did not include the painting of the masonry piers.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.3.1, A.3.2, A.3.3, A.3.4, A.3.5, A.3.6, A.3.7, A.3.8, A.3.9, A.6.1, A.6.2, A.6.3, A.6.4, A.6.5

Vote: 1611 S. Troost Ave. (Swan Lake)

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

Commissioner Turner then made a motion to approve Item 2: Replacement of door and hardware. 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.3.1, A.3.2, A.3.3, A.3.4, A.3.5, A.3.6, A.3.7, A.3.8, A.3.9

Vote: 1611 S. Troost Ave. (Swan Lake)

Item 2: Replacement of door and hardware

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

Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the proposal for Item 1: Replacement of rail on porch with the conditions that the rail have four (4) balusters for every three (3) existing balusters, and that a baluster be placed against each column. 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, A.6.1, A.6.2, A.6.3, A.6.4, A.6.5

Vote: 1611 S. Troost Ave. (Swan Lake)

Item 1: Replacement of rail on porch

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

Commissioner Becker complimented Ms. Gonzalez on the treatment of the columns and the siding. In response to Commissioner Sanders' and Commissioner Townsend's earlier questions, Ms. Blank read aloud Section A.2.5 of the Unified

Design Guidelines for Residential Structures, which verified that painting previously painted masonry does not require an HP permit review.

2. HP-0386-2022 / 1807 S. Quincy Ave. (Swan Lake)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 16, 2022

Applicant: Steven Jones

Proposals:

1. Replacement of siding
2. Replacement of trim
3. Removal of shutters

Staff presented its report, and the applicant, Steven Jones, was present. Commissioner Turner asked Mr. Jones if he had anything to add, and he stated that he did not. Commissioner Turner reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee reviewed the application and that Mr. Jones specified he would be removing the shutters at that meeting. Mr. Jones noted that the owner may want to reinstall them after the siding and trim have been replaced, depending on how the house looks without them. Ms. Good stated that the request for the removal of the shutters was added to the agenda for today's meeting after Mr. Jones told the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee that he planned to remove the shutters. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Turner, Mr. Jones stated that storm doors were not present on the set of doors above the porch but that they may have been previously. Mr. Jones informed the commissioners that the owners may want to make the second-story doors operable and build a rail above the port-cochere in the future. Commissioner Turner recalled that Mr. Jones had stated the soffit and brackets would be retained, and Mr. Jones concurred. Commissioner Ellington agreed with Commissioner Turner's summary of the subcommittee review and expressed approval of the application. Commission Sanders commented that he was certain that the shutters were not original to the house and expressed support for the project only if the shutters are permanently removed.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Sanders made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the shutters be removed permanently. Commissioner Turner inquired whether one-inch (0'-1") by four-inch (0'-4") trim would be used around the windows, and Mr. Jones answered affirmatively, offering his project at 1616 South Quincy Avenue as an example. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKee 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, A.2.4, A.2.5

Vote: 1807 S. Quincy Ave. (Swan Lake)

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

3. HP-0387-2022 / 1519 S. Norfolk Ave. (North Maple Ridge)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: August 16, 2022

Applicant: Kimberly McCoy

Proposal:

1. Construction of addition

Staff presented its report, noting that the roof over the addition would match the existing roof. The applicant, Kimberly McCoy, was present. Commissioner Turner gave a brief overview of what was discussed during the review of the application by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. He stated that the subcommittee was concerned about the continuity of the siding along the side of the house and if they could salvage enough siding off the back of the house that would be the preferred option. Commissioner Ellington stated that the applicant had addressed his concerns about the roof material.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner McKee made a motion to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Becker 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.2.3, B.2.4, B.2.5, B.3.1, B.3.2, B.3.3, B.4.1, B.4.2, B.7.1, B.7.2, B.7.3, B.7.4

Vote: 1519 S. Norfolk Ave. (North Maple Ridge)

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

4. HP-0380-2022 / 308 W. King St. (The Heights/Brady Heights)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Dates: July 19, 2022, August 16, 2022

Applicants: Joel & Cassia Carr

Proposals:

1. Replacement of siding
2. Replacement of fascia and soffit
3. Installation of vents in gables
4. Installation of brackets under eaves
5. Replacement of windows
6. Replacement of trim around windows
7. Replacement of window with door on east side of residence
8. Replacement of door and hardware on north facade
9. Replacement of garage door
10. Reconstruction of porch
11. Construction of rail on porch
12. Construction of patio
13. Replacement of driveway
14. Replacement of fence
15. Installation of light fixtures

Project initiated without an Historic Preservation Permit

Staff presented its report, summarizing the suggestions made by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee and the changes made to the application during each review. Staff noted that the installation of light fixtures came up during the review of the application by the subcommittee on August 16, 2022, and was added to the preservation commission agenda as Item 15. Staff also added that the subcommittee had recommended approval of Items 1 through 4 and 6 through 14 with several conditions. Item 5 was forwarded without a recommendation. The applicants, Joel Carr and Cassia Carr, were present. Commissioner Turner announced that each item would be

addressed one-by-one for discussion. Commissioner Turner directed commissioners' attention to Item 1: Replacement of siding and expressed the opinion that the house resembled a Ranch style more than a Craftsman Bungalow and noted the mix of styles. Commissioner Turner stated that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee did not have much discussion on the board and batten siding, the replacement of the fascia and soffit, or the installation of the vents in the gables. He commented that the brackets under the eaves would offer a nice level of detail and would be acceptable even if placed in the south gable. Staff asked for clarification on the location of the brackets on the west side, and Mr. Carr explained that they would be adding two brackets under the eaves to the west of the porch. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Sanders, Mr. Carr clarified that no additional brackets would be placed near the garage. Commissioner Sanders said he would like to go ahead and make a motion on Items 1 through 4 before moving on to the next items.

Commissioner Sanders made a motion to approve Item 1: Replacement of siding, Item 2: Replacement of fascia and soffit, Item 3: Installation of vents in gables, and Item 4: Installation of brackets under eaves as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellington 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, A.2.4, A.2.5, A.5.1, A.5.2, A.5.3, A.5.4, A.5.5, A.5.6, A.5.7

Vote: 308 W. King St. (The Heights/Brady Heights)

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

Commissioner Turner suggested that the commissioners skip any discussion of Item 5: Replacement of windows until the end since there would be a lot of discussion on that item. He moved on to Item 6: Replacement of trim around windows and said he thought the addition of the sill and the cap over the windows was a distinct improvement and would add to the Ranch style of the house. Commissioner Turner continued to Item 7: Replacement of window with door on east side of residence and Item 12: Construction of patio, and he noted that the subcommittee did not have much discussion but observed that the patio would be constructed from concrete rather than being similar in style to the front porch, which has a deck and rail. Commissioner Turner noted that, because the front of the house faces King Street, the new door on the east side, the new patio, and the front porch would all be visible from Denver Avenue. Upon a request for clarification by Commissioner Sanders, Mr. Carr and Ms. Carr clarified that the property at 308 West King Street abuts Denver Avenue. Commissioner Turner directed attention to Item 8: Replacement of door and hardware on north façade, and Item 9: Replacement of garage door. Commissioner Turner reported that the subcommittee members felt the simple styling of the proposed Craftsman style door and hardware was more appropriate to the style of the house, and Commissioner Ellington agreed that the style would fit in well with the style of the proposed siding. Commissioner Turner stated that the garage door matched the front door well. Commissioner Turner moved onto Item 10: Reconstruction of the porch and Item 11: Construction of rail on porch and expressed the opinion that the proposal would clean up the porch quite a lot by removing several elements. For clarification, Commissioner Turner asked the applicant if they had removed the ramp connecting the driveway to the porch, and Mr. Carr answered affirmatively and noted

that a set of steps would be constructed in its place. Commissioner Turner reported that the subcommittee had asked the applicant to add a trim board along the edges of the Trex composite deck boards, which would run perpendicular to the house. Mr. Carr added that the subcommittee had requested that cap and base trim be added to the columns. Addressing Item 12: Construction of patio, Commissioner Turner stated that he had recommended the material match that of the front porch during the subcommittee review on August 16, 2022, but that the applicants selected concrete because of the cost. Moving on to Item 13: Replacement of driveway, Commissioner Turner stated that the reduction of the width of the driveway to match the existing curb cut would be an improvement. Commissioner Turner reported that the subcommittee was satisfied with Item 14: Replacement of fence and only requested that the metal posts to be reused from the existing chain-link fence be no taller than the pickets. He reminded the commissioners that the subcommittee did not have a submittal for Item 15: Installation of light fixtures, so there was not a recommendation. Commissioner Turner asked if anyone had any questions or concerns on any of the application, aside from Items 5 and 15. Commissioner Townsend asked if the open gable over the front porch would remain open, and the applicant answered affirmatively. Commissioner Townsend questioned whether the open gable would be appropriate, and Commissioner Turner expressed the opinion that it would be an appropriate detail for a Ranch style house. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Turner, Mr. Carr explained that the siding in the gable and the ceiling of the porch were removed because the ceiling was so low. Commissioner Ellington noted that had been discussed by the subcommittee. Commissioner Sanders inquired about the skirting on the porch, and Mr. Carr stated that one-inch (0'-1") by six-inch (0'-6") painted boards had previously been present and would be replaced with one-inch (0'-1") by six-inch (0'-6") cedar boards placed vertically. Commissioner Sanders questioned whether the skirting constructed with vertical boards would be a historically appropriate treatment, and Commissioner Turner stated that a historical treatment would probably be an open crawl space under the porch or an open lattice around the porch but noted that an open crawl space under a porch would be atypical of a Ranch style house. Mr. Carr pointed out examples he had provided of other residences that had been sources of inspiration for the design and color selection. Commissioner Sanders asked the applicants if they had considered a wood lattice, and Mr. Carr explained that the space under the deck is so open that one would be able to see straight through the deck from King Street. Commissioner Becker indicated approval of the proposed cedar skirting and expressed a preference for it over lattice. Commissioner Sanders said he felt the monochromatic color of the previous skirting almost looked like cement or vinyl but expressed acceptance of cedar skirting if there was a clear delineation between the skirting and the trim around the porch floor. Mr. Carr explained that he would be staining the cedar boards so that the skirting would match the railing. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Sanders, Mr. Carr confirmed that landscaping would be planted in the area in front of the porch. Commissioner McKee asked the commissioners about running the boards horizontally instead of vertically, but Commissioner Ellington felt that doing so would not be consistent with the siding on the house since it would be running in the opposite direction. Commissioner Sanders agreed. Commissioner Ellington expressed approval of the proposed garage door and front door because it would be consistent with the siding and indicated that the porch should be as well. Commissioner Turner asked the applicants if they had considered constructing the porch with the same materials and board and batten design as the siding, and Mr. Carr indicated a willingness to do so. Commissioner Sanders agreed with the suggestion. Ms. Carr indicated a preference for the cedar skirting but acceptance of the suggestion if it were preferred by the commission. Other commissioners agreed with the suggestion to match the skirting to the siding. Mr. Carr pointed out that constructing the skirting to match the siding would alleviate the large amount of cedar elsewhere on the porch. Commissioner Townsend suggested giving the option of either cedar or board and batten skirting.

Commissioner Sanders made a motion to approve Item 10: Reconstruction of porch with the condition that the porch skirting be a board and batten style in the same materials and condition as the siding on the house, including the trim. Commissioner Townsend informed the applicants that they could seek an amendment to the Approved Proposal if they decided to construct the skirting differently or needed to make any other changes to their application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellington and approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.5.1, A.5.2, A.5.3, A.5.4, A.5.5, A.5.6, A.5.7, A.6.1, A.6.2, A.6.3, A.6.4, A.6.5

Vote: 308 W. King St. (The Heights/Brady Heights)

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

Commissioner Turner asked if there was any more discussion on Items 6 through 9 and 11 through 14. Commissioner Sanders asked if the door that was installed on the east side of the house was a steel door. Mr. Carr answered that it was steel and clarified that the proposed front door was also made from steel. Upon inquiries from Commissioner Sanders, Mr. Carr confirmed that both doors would be painted and would have black hardware. Commissioner Sanders questioned whether steel was generally an acceptable material, particularly in the Brady Heights Historic Preservation Overlay (The Heights), and Commissioner Turner stated that the Unified Design Guidelines do not prohibit steel doors.

Commissioner Becker moved to approve Item 6: Replacement of trim around windows, Item 7: Replacement of window with door on east side of residence, Item 8: Replacement of door and hardware on north façade, Item 9: Replacement of garage door, Item 11: Construction of rail on porch, Item 12: Construction of patio, Item 13: Replacement of driveway, and Item 14: Replacement of fence as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellington and approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.3.1, A.3.2, A.3.3, A.3.4, A.3.5, A.3.6, A.3.7, A.3.8, A.3.9, A. 4.1, A.4.2, A.4.3, A.4.4, A.4.5, A.4.6, A.4.7, A.4.8, A.6.1, A.6.2, A.6.3, A.6.4, A.6.5, G.1.1, G.1.2, G.1.3, G.1.4, G.1.5, G.2.1, G.2.2, G.2.3

Vote: 308 W. King St. (The Heights/Brady Heights)

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

Commissioner Turner opened discussion to Item 15: Installation of light fixtures. Staff directed commissioners' attention to images of the proposed fixtures submitted by the applicants. Upon requests for clarification from Commissioners Turner and Sanders, Mr.

Carr verified the placement of the light fixtures above the garage door, near the door on the east side of the house, and in the ceiling of the porch. Commissioner Sanders inquired about the finish of the fixture on the porch ceiling, and Mr. Carr stated that the gold finish was proposed. The discussion continued about the color of the finish of the light fixture on the front porch. The applicant stated that if the gold finish was not satisfactory, he could possibly order it with a black finish or paint it black. Commissioner Sanders expressed the opinion that the fixture was on the edge of being historically appropriate but indicated that he might accept it because of the eclectic style of the house, although he expressed a preference for a black finish. Commissioner Townsend asked if the fixture would be visible since it would be hung from the ceiling of the porch. Mr. Carr answered that it probably would not, but it might be slightly visible through the gable. Ms. Carr stated that they intentionally selected the black and gold fixtures because they like the combination. Commissioner Becker stated that she did not have a problem with the gold finish, especially since the other fixtures have a gold element to them, and agreed with comments about the eclectic style of the house. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Townsend, Ms. Carr stated that her grandfather had purchased the house in the 1980s, and Mr. Carr guessed that he had constructed the most recent addition.

Commissioner Ellington moved approval of Item 15: Installation of light fixtures. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Becker but failed due to a lack of majority.

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

Vote: 308 W. King St. (The Heights/Brady Heights)

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

Commissioner Townsend asked why those who opposed the proposal did so. Commissioner Turner stated that he did not feel that the light fixture proposed for the front porch matched the style of the house because it resembled a Mid-Century Modern style. Commissioner McKee agreed and clarified that she did like the other proposed fixtures. Commissioner Sanders stated that the mixture of black and gold finishes on the fixtures proposed for the garage and east side of the residence were acceptable but preferred something other than gold alone for the light fixture on the porch. Ms. Carr requested that the commission make a motion on the east-facing door and garage light fixtures only and offered to return with another proposal for the light fixture on the porch at a later date. The commissioners agreed with her suggestion.

Commissioner Turner moved approval of Item 15: Replacement of light fixtures for the light fixtures above the garage and on the east side of the residence only but not the light fixture on the front porch. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKee and passed unanimously.

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

Vote: 308 W. King St. (The Heights/Brady Heights)

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Turner			Parker

2. Becker
3. Ellington
4. McKee
5. Sanders
6. Townsend

Bumgarner
Grant
Reeds
Shears

Commissioner Turner asked if any of the commissioners were present at the first review of the application by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. Commissioners Sanders and Becker stated that they were present during that review. Commissioner Sanders explained that the subcommittee had a problem with the windows because matching the original window material is required for houses in The Heights. Commissioner Sanders recalled that the subcommittee agreed that, regardless of the alterations that had been made to the house over time, the original material of the windows would have been wood. He stated that there has been a lot of controversy in The Heights about the wood window requirement and the preservation commission has had to be very tough about honoring that requirement in the Unified Design Guidelines. Commissioner Sanders stated that deviating from the guideline would set a bad precedent. Commissioner Becker read aloud from Guideline A.4.3, which stated, "When selecting replacements, use physical or pictorial evidence. If no evidence exists, select windows which are consistent with the architectural style of your home." Commissioner Becker questioned how to determine what the original material would have been if that evidence is not present and what type of window would be consistent with the architectural style. Commissioner McKee pointed out an image of the residence as it previously appeared in Google Street View and observed that a window near the rear of the house appeared to be a double-hung wooden window. Commissioner Sanders requested clarification from the applicants, and Mr. Carr stated that the window had not been present when they purchased the residence. Commissioner McKee expressed the opinion that there was pictorial evidence of probable wooden windows and asked about the date of the image. Ms. Good stated that she believed the image was from 2014. Commissioner Turner stated that his concern was not necessarily the material but the proportions of the frame of the window. Commissioner Turner explained that typically aluminum and vinyl windows do not have the same setbacks, proportions, or shadow lines that wood windows or good replacement windows have. Commissioner Turner indicated acceptance of the color and single-pane sashes and said that the addition of exterior muntins might be a step in the right direction but would not be supported by previous images of the residence. Commissioner Turner emphasized that his biggest concern is that the windows that had been installed do not have the correct proportions for windows in the neighborhood. Commissioner Sanders stated that he agreed with Commissioner Turner and hoped to meet the applicants somewhere in the middle so that they would not have to replace the entire frame along with the window. Commissioner Sanders expressed approval of the window trim that had been approved and indicated support for that trim with wood windows installed. Commissioner Sanders emphasized that the neighborhood worked hard to include the specific guideline about window materials in The Heights and that he was confident that the house originally would have had wood windows. Commissioner Turner inquired whether Commissioner Parker, who lives in The Heights, had been present at the first review of the application by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee, and Commissioner Sanders stated that she had been. Ms. Good stated that Commissioner Parker had said some of the same things during that review and noted that the subcommittee had based discussion on the assumption that the windows would have originally been wood. Commissioner Sanders recalled that Commissioner Parker had also expressed concern about the lack of shadow lines in the windows that had been installed. Commissioner Becker stated that she did not disagree with Commissioner Sanders or Turner but wanted to be sure that the preservation commission's decision would be consistent with the Unified Design Guidelines. Commissioner Ellington agreed with the issues raised by Commissioners

Sanders and Turner. Commissioner Turner further explained his rationale, stating that each window appeared to be in one plane with little offset between the bottom sash and top sash and that the stiles were much thinner than those typical of a wood window. Mr. Carr pointed to an image he had submitted showing wood windows on a neighboring residence that he said had similar shadow lines and similar depth between the glass and the outside of the trim. Upon requests from Commissioners Becker and Sanders, Mr. Carr clarified the location of the residences in the images. Commissioner Turner reviewed the Unified Design Guidelines and stated that he did not see a way to approve the proposal. Commissioner Turner stated that the Unified Design Guidelines are clear on the issue, noting that he felt a case could be made for approval if the sashes were roughly proportional to those of a wood window. Commissioner Turner showed the applicants which dimensions he was referring to—the stiles, the rails, and the offset between the sashes—and stated that he could not make a case to support the request for the replacement of the windows as proposed.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner moved to deny Item 5: Replacement of windows. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellington and the motion to deny passed unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.4.1, A.4.2, A.4.3, A.4.4, A.4.5, A.4.6, A.4.7, A.4.8

Vote: 308 W. King St. (The Heights/Brady Heights)

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

Ms. Carr requested clarification about the types of windows that would be acceptable, and Commissioner Turner stated that a window with similar proportions to that of an original wood window would be important. Commissioner Turner noted Guideline A.4.5.1, which requires owners to match the original historic window material in The Heights. Commissioner Turner expressed the opinion that the house probably originally had wood windows, so any replacement windows should be wood. Commissioner Turner then informed the applicants of their right to appeal the decision to the Board of Adjustment. Commissioners Townsend, McKee, and Ellington agreed that the guidelines would direct the applicants to install wood windows. Ms. Carr requested clarification about whether Guideline A.4.5.1 requires wood windows or requires that the original window material be matched. Commissioner Sanders explained that the guideline requires the original window material to be matched and stated that the original window material on the residence most likely would have been wood. Ms. Carr guessed that most residences on the street would probably have originally had wood windows, and Commissioner Sanders agreed. Commissioner Sanders complimented the applicants on their project and the improvements to the residence and referenced a similar decision the preservation commission recently made about the replacement of windows at another residence in The Heights. Mr. Carr stated that a mixture of window materials had been present when they purchased the residence, but Commissioner Townsend explained that the existing windows when the house was purchased could differ from the original windows. Commissioner Turner questioned whether a replacement in-kind of windows could be approved at the staff level, but Ms. Good stated that Section 70.070-K of the Tulsa Zoning Code authorizes the preservation officer to approve the replacement

of materials with equivalent materials only if the work complies with the design guidelines of the subject historic preservation district. Ms. Carr inquired about the options for moving forward, and Commissioner Turner replied that they could propose a different type of window or appeal the decision to the Board of Adjustment.

- C. Reports
 - 1. Staff Report
Staff reported on Work completed at 1616 South Quincy Avenue.
 - 2. Chair Report
None
- D. New Business
None
- E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items
None
- F. Public Comment
None
- G. Adjournment
Commissioner Turner adjourned the Regular Meeting at 6:15 P.M.