



TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017, 4:30 P.M.

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

A. Opening Matters

1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum

Chairman Craddock called the Regular Meeting to order at 4:31 P.M.

Members Present

Mike Craddock, Chair
Ted Reeds, Vice-Chair
David Schoell, Secretary
Chris Bumgarner*
Peter Grant
Susan McKee
Mary Lee Townsend
Jim Turner

Members Absent

David Pounds
Robert Shears
Michael Birkes

Staff Present

Addison Spradlin, Amber Wagoner, John Paganelli, Bob Edmiston

*Late

Others Present

Tom Neal, Shaun Schaefer

2. Approval of Minutes from October 24, 2017

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

Vote: Meeting Minutes, October 24, 2017

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Craddock			Bumgarner
2. Reeds			Pounds
3. Schoell			Shears
4. Grant			Birkes
5. McKee			
6. Townsend			
7. Turner			

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

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-17-110 / 1602 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)**

Applicant: Shaun Schaefer

Requests:

1. Removal of two chimneys
2. Replacement of front door with Craftsman-Style door

Staff presented its report. The applicant was present and noted that the chimneys no longer served a purpose, that the intention was “to open up the attic” but the chimneys were in the way, and that the removal of the chimneys did not greatly alter the appearance. According to the applicant, the door is not in good condition, and the new door would be an improvement. Commissioner Craddock inquired if the front chimney was damaged. The applicant responded that the front chimney was damaged and in poor condition. Commissioner Grant asked the applicant if there was a fireplace in the living room and was informed that there was not a fireplace. The applicant commented that, if the chimneys had a purpose, they would be kept, but, since they were once used as routes for vents for appliances and the furnace, they currently have no purpose. Apparently the attic is the only place they are visible. The applicant stated that the main purpose was preservation of the appearance of the exterior and again proposed that the removal of the chimneys would not affect the appearance of the residence. Commissioner Reeds inquired if the applicant intended to install a new roof, and the applicant responded that the roof had recently been replaced and the areas where the chimneys are located would be filled with the same shingles that are currently on the roof. Commissioner Turner inquired if there were any vents inserted in the chimneys and was informed that no vents were installed. Commissioner Turner then inquired whether the two items would be voted on together or separately. Commissioner McKee requested that the two items be voted on separately.

As there was no further discussion regarding the chimneys, Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the removal of the chimneys. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and was approved by majority.

Vote: 1602 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)

1. Removal of two chimneys

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Craddock	McKee		Pounds
2. Reeds			Shears
3. Schoell			Birkes
4. Bumgarner			
5. Grant			
6. Townsend			
7. Turner			

Commissioner Craddock stated that the discussion of the proposal for installation of the Craftsman-Style door would begin. Commissioner Craddock then noted that, according to the specifications, the door was steel. Commissioner Reeds inquired if the applicant had considered a wooden door. The applicant responded that a wooden door had been considered but the appearances in both materials were similar. The applicant commented that, based on recommendations from staff and through research, this particular door was chosen due to its style and durability. Commissioner Grant stated that the advantages of a wooden door were the profile of the muntins, the presence of true divided lights, and its overall appearance. The applicant responded that a wooden door would be installed if the commissions preferred, and Commissioner Craddock confirmed that preference. Commissioner Reeds commented on the distinct difference between the two materials and added that both doors would provide security for the home. The applicant then stated that the intention was a focus on the style of the door and that this door was consistent with the Craftsman Style. Commissioner Schoell noted the advantages of a wooden door and the different styles available with this material, including details. Commissioner Grant stated that the wooden door would allow for a shelf below the window that is common in the Craftsman-Style door. Commissioner Schoell then noted that the metal door seemed to lack the dimension commonly seen in the wooden Craftsman-Style door. Commissioner Townsend inquired whether the commission would have to request a continuance on the application since the door was not a replacement in kind. Commissioner Craddock stated that a motion to accept a wooden door with true divided lights would be appropriate. Commissioner Townsend then inquired about the hardware for the door shown in the staff report but was not included in the proposal. Staff stated that the commission could allow the applicant to amend his proposal. Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the door with the conditions that the material for the door be wood with true-divided-light windows with 5/8 inch (0'-5/8") muntins and the hardware shown in the staff report. Commissioner Reeds stated that he would like to discuss the hardware more and that it needed to be more rectangular. The applicant responded that he discussed the door and the

hardware with staff and that the hardware was suggested by staff. Commissioner Craddock stated that the reason for a specific recommendation was the shared expectations by the commission and the applicant for the work to be performed. The applicant assured the commission of his readiness to comply with the recommendation about the hardware. Commissioner McKee stated that the applicant would have to return for the approval of the hardware and therefore should also return for the approval of the door. Commissioner Grant noted that the proposed hardware did not have a lock set to which the applicant responded that a deadbolt lock would be installed. The applicant inquired about any process whereby the commission could approve an amendment that would not require the applicant to return to the commission. Commissioner Turner stated that there was the option to continue this discussion at the next Regular Meeting of the Tulsa Preservation Commission, which would allow the applicant to resubmit the proposal for material for the door and its hardware. Commissioner Turner also noted that it was not necessary for the applicant to attend the meeting but recommended attendance in order to answer questions by the commission. Commissioners Reeds, Townsend, and McKee recommended that the applicant amend the proposal for the door. The applicant then requested more specific information about the hardware, and Commissioner Grant suggested a handle rather than a knob. The applicant stated that a handle had originally been considered and that he would be pleased to use that type of hardware. Commissioner Craddock asked the applicant if he would be willing to provide the appropriate information on the door and the hardware if the commission continued the review at the next Regular Meeting. The applicant indicated his readiness to do so, and Commissioner Townsend suggested that the applicant present the proposed door and hardware to the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. Commissioner Grant inquired about his previous motion to which Commissioner Craddock stated that it was not seconded. Commissioner Grant withdrew his motion. Commissioner Reeds stated that a review by the subcommittee would not be necessary.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Reeds made a motion to continue the review of the proposal for replacement of the door at the next Regular Meeting of the Tulsa Preservation Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKee and approved unanimously.

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Craddock			Pounds
2. Reeds			Shears
3. Schoell			Birkes
4. Bumgarner			
5. Grant			
6. McKee			
7. Townsend			
8. Turner			

2. HP-17-113 / 1705 S. Cincinnati Pl. (N. Maple Ridge)

Applicants: Annie Heartfield Hartzog

Representative: Tom Neal

Requests:

1. Construction of retaining wall
2. Replacement of vinyl fence with wooden fence

Staff presented its report. Commissioner Craddock asked the applicant's representative, Mr. Neal, about the proposed height of the retaining wall and its location on the site. Mr. Neal responded that some regrading of the site would probably have to happen and the goal is a retaining wall only thirty inches (0'-30") above grade. Mr. Neal then stated that the wall would follow the property line and then fall into the line of the hill on the west side of the site. Apparently two sewer lines intersect on the front of the property so a section would be regraded to avoid any complications that may arise. Commissioner Craddock inquired if there was a manhole on the property, and Mr. Neal confirmed its location. Mr. Neal then stated that the intersection of the two sewer lines causes the north section of the lot to be unsuited for construction. Commissioner Reeds then presented the report on behalf of the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. Commissioner Reeds noted that the alterations recommended by the subcommittee had been adopted and commented on his preference for more shadow in the line between lantern and post. Commissioner Reeds then requested clarification about the connection between the lantern and the post. Mr. Neal responded that originally the lanterns were to be custom made but that the lantern currently proposed was the more economical choice and that the lantern's base would be enclosed and attached to the top of the post. The purpose of enclosure of the lantern's base with wood would be concealment of any conduit as well as the metal post which supports the lantern. Commissioner McKee inquired whether the lanterns would actually sit on the wooden enclosure and whether anything would be done to prevent rot. Mr. Neal responded that the lantern would provide a cap to those portions of the fence and a cap and trim would be installed along the remainder of the fence, which would be constructed with a pattern similar to other Craftsman-Style fences.

The discussion then shifted to the proposal for the retaining wall. Commissioner Reeds inquired whether the wall would be dry-stack or constructed with mortar. Mr. Neal responded that the joints would be tightly mortared and would resemble other construction in the neighborhood. Commissioner Schoell commented that there was not a detailed description of the wall included in the proposal and asked if the objective was construction without a structural support. Mr. Neal stated that due to the height of the wall a structural support would not be necessary and that the proper footing for the wall would be installed. Mr. Neal added that he was under the impression that Ms. Hartzog's intention was to match the footing width with a minimum width of twelve inches (0'-12") for the wall and that the stone in

the wall would be staggered to deal with pressure. The material of the capstone would match the material of the wall. Commissioner Schoell inquired about the width of the capstone and was informed that, based on assumptions; the capstone would extend only a few inches. Mr. Neal indicated his readiness to follow any recommendations. Commissioner Turner expressed his appreciation of the example of the retaining wall with the chiseled edge of the stone. Commissioner Reeds recommended weep holes to prevent damage from the freeze-and-thaw cycle. Commissioner Schoell inquired whether the wall would be slightly stepped and was informed that it would.

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

Vote: 1705 S. Cincinnati Pl. (N. Maple Ridge)

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Craddock			Pounds
2. Reeds			Shears
3. Schoell			Birkes
4. Bumgarner			
5. Grant			
6. McKee			
7. Townsend			
8. Turner			

C. Discussion of Agenda and Schedule for Annual Retreat

Commissioner Craddock began the discussion by stating that the previous retreat was held at the beginning of the year. Staff commented that the 2017 Annual Retreat was held on Saturday, May 6. Commissioner Craddock stated that usually the commission conducts the retreat earlier in the year on a Saturday morning. Commissioner Craddock proposed the dates of January 13 and January 20. A majority of the commissioners responded that January 20 would be the better of the two dates. Commissioner Craddock requested that staff notify commissioners via electronic mail.

The discussion then focused on specific agenda items for the annual retreat. Commissioner Reeds stated that the previous meeting Minutes recorded the discussion of the repercussions for violations of conditions of approval for Historic Preservation Permits, which therefore constitute violations of the Zoning Code, and commented that this issue needs to be addressed at the retreat. Commissioner Craddock suggested the commissioners consider other topics for the agenda.

D. Reports

1. Chair Report

Commissioner Craddock welcomed Bob Edmiston, who had been absent due to recovery from surgery. Commissioner Craddock then welcomed Amber Wagoner and John Paganelli, who introduced themselves to the commission.

Commissioner Craddock then focused the discussion on the Board of Adjustment Meeting in which an appeal of a previously denied application was reviewed. The Board of Adjustment granted this appeal. Commissioner Craddock stated that the Board of Adjustment was not in favor of the decision reached the commission and had described the Tulsa Preservation Commission's decisions as "arbitrary" and "capricious". Commissioner Craddock expressed his displeasure with the conduct of the review and expressed his opinion that the Board of Adjustment had attacked the Tulsa Preservation Commission.

Discussion then focused on notification of distributors of windows, including information on the type of windows acceptable for installation in the districts. Commissioner Turner suggested a meeting between the Board of Adjustment and the Tulsa Preservation Commission to review the Unified Design Guidelines and the goals of the commission. Commissioner Craddock commented that he had spoken to staff about this request and hoped it would happen in the near future. Commissioner Craddock stated that the commission would like window manufacturers and their representatives to be aware of the commission's expectations. Mr. Edmiston stated that he will inquire about the willingness of the Board of Adjustment to meet with the Tulsa Preservation Commission and inquired whether the preference is a review of the commission's role and the procedure for appeal or whether the preference is a review of the purpose of the commission and its guidelines. Mr. Edmiston then commented on the decorum of the Board of Adjustment Meeting. Commissioner Turner inquired if a letter to the mayor would be appropriate, and Mr. Edmiston responded that Commissioner Craddock could write a personal letter. Commissioner Craddock stated that he had been encouraged to write a letter and added that the Board of Adjustment is the last step in the process before review by district court. Mr. Edmiston stated that there is a legal conflict of interest for the City's Legal Department because the staff represents both the Tulsa Preservation Commission and the Board of Adjustment. Commissioner Townsend then inquired about the way to address the comment from applicants that "other people in the neighborhood have what I'm asking for", and Mr. Edmiston responded that he feels the commission addresses this issue well and that it is not fair to violate guidelines for specific applicants based on violations within the neighborhoods. Mr. Edmiston then commented that the ordinance allows deviation from the guidelines but deviation poses a challenge due to the diligence required for the commission's decisions. Commissioner Turner asked if a public notice of the appeals to the Board of Adjustment was required. Many commissioners stated that

they were unaware of the appeal, and Commissioner Craddock stated that staff was informed about the appeal. Commissioner Turner inquired whether the applicant was required to provide the neighbors with notice of the appeal. Mr. Edmiston stated that the neighbors should have been informed of the appeal. Staff volunteered to confer with colleagues at INCOG about the process of appeal with the Board of Adjustment.

2. Staff Report

Staff reminded the commissioners to complete the survey previously distributed and to respond to the invitation to the Holiday Party. Commissioner Craddock reminded the commissioners of the date and time of the Holiday Party. Commissioner Reeds requested that a current list of attendees be distributed, and staff responded that a list of attendees would be distributed via electronic mail.

E. New Business

None

F. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

None

G. Adjournment

Chairman Craddock adjourned the Regular Meeting at 5:28 P.M.