



TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 24, 2019, 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

Commissioner Schoell called the Regular Meeting to order at 4:30 P.M.

Members Present

David W. Schoell, P.E., Chair
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS, Vice-Chair
Chris J. Bumgarner
Susan J. McKee, MFA
Katelyn C. Parker, RA
Ted A. Reeds, II, AIA
James E. Turner, AIA

Members Absent

Joy Jones, Secretary
Holly Becker
Robert L. Shears, ASLA
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.

Staff Present

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

Others Present

Greg C. Clack
Carolyn L. Clack

2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 12, 2019

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

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 12, 2019

In Favor

Schoell
Grant
Bumgarner
McKee
Parker
Reeds
Turner

Opposed

Abstaining

Not Present

Jones
Becker
Shears
Townsend

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

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0128-2019 / 1420 E. 20th St.** (Swan Lake)
Applicants: Greg C. and Carolyn L. Clack
Proposal:
 1. Replacement of doors on garage

Staff presented its report, noting that the proposal was subject to review because the garage was attached to the residence. Staff reported that each proposed metal door had a row of eight (8) windows above an array of twenty-four (24) panels, while each existing wooden door had a row of six (6) windows above an array of eighteen (18) panels. According to staff, the Scope of Work was so modest that the proposal had been forwarded directly to the Tulsa Preservation Commission without review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. The applicants added that the existing doors suffered from wood rot, so they wished to replace the doors with modern materials. Upon an inquiry by the commission, the applicants confirmed that the proposed doors would have the same panel arrangement as the existing doors but with eight (8) sets of windows and panels rather than six (6). Commissioner Turner then turned discussion to the division in the center between each set of four windows and panels. According to the applicants, the center line on each garage door would be slightly wider than the other divisions but was not intended to give the appearance of two (2) separate doors. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Grant, the applicants confirmed the doors would not have any hardware.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and approved by majority. Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, B.6.3

Vote: 1420 E. 20th St. (Swan Lake)

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

2. **HP-0127-2019 / 1720 S. Newport Ave.** (North Maple Ridge)
Applicant: Phillip Doyle
Proposal:
 1. Construction of walkway
 2. Construction of bulkheads
 3. Construction of steps
 4. Construction of wing walls

Staff presented its report, noting the proposal was meant to provide access to the residence from the public sidewalk. According to the applicant, the objective was the match of the elements, such as bulkheads and wing walls, on two (2) adjacent residences. Staff reported that the Scope of Work was so modest that, at the applicant's request, the proposal had been forwarded directly to the Tulsa Preservation Commission without review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. The applicant was not present to provide comment. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Grant, staff relayed that there was probably an entry from the driveway to the porch. Commissioner Turner noted that the wing walls were designated as optional on the Site Plan, and staff confirmed that the applicant had not yet decided whether they wished to construct wing walls but was aware that a change in the proposal would require additional review by the Tulsa Preservation Commission.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the application as presented with brick wing walls. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and approved unanimously. Guidelines cited: A.1.3, A.1.4, A.6.1, A.6.2, A.6.5, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.2, G.2.2, G.2.3

Vote: 1720 S. Newport Ave. (North Maple Ridge)

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

C. Reports

1. Chair Report
None

2. Staff Report

Staff reported that the review of the appeal of the denial of the application for Historic Preservation Permit Number HP-0116-2019 had been postponed until the Regular Meeting of the City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment on October 22. Commissioner Bumgarner commented that an acceptance of the appeal could undermine future decisions made by the Tulsa Preservation Commission and inspire other homeowners in historic neighborhoods to complete Work without an Historic Preservation Permit. Had the Tulsa Preservation Commission been given the opportunity to review the proposal prior to Work being done, he contended, the applicant would have been given options for the treatment of the terra cotta roof. Commissioner Bumgarner stated that the Tulsa Preservation Commission plays an important role in safeguarding the North Maple Ridge Historic District and requested that other members of the Tulsa Preservation Commission attend the review and be prepared to present any alternative solutions and a recommendation for resolution moving forward. Upon an

inquiry by the commission, Legal Staff commented that the Board could uphold the decision of the Tulsa Preservation Commission, reverse the decision, or modify the decision in some way. Legal Staff stated that, with this type of appeal, it would be assumed that the decision of the official was correct, and the Board would have to find that an error had been made to reverse the decision. Commissioner Grant commented that maintenance for a terra cotta roof should be conducted almost entirely underneath the tile, replacing pieces only as needed. Commissioners Reeds and Schoell noted that other tile roofs in the district had been repaired and replaced in kind, using as many original tiles as possible. Upon further inquiry, Legal Staff stated that the Tulsa Preservation Commission could communicate with the Board of Adjustment by submitting a statement to its clerk. Upon the request for the State Historic Preservation Office's comments, staff reminded the commission that the National Register Coordinator had previously stated that the replacement of the tiles with shingles, while unfortunate, was not so significant an alteration as to jeopardize the residence's status as a Contributing Resource to the district on the National Register of Historic Places. Staff offered to pursue this inquiry with the National Register Coordinator but noted that the comment was one interpretation and that the authority to protect the character of the district lies with the Tulsa Preservation Commission. Staff noted that the tile roof was cited as a feature in the residence's description as a Contributing Resource in the nomination. Upon an inquiry, staff stated that if the Board of Adjustment affirmed the decision, the commission could choose to direct staff to contact the Working in Neighborhoods Department and request the issuance of a citation. Staff commented that a statement had been submitted to the Board of Adjustment explaining the Tulsa Preservation Commission's rationale in its decision, indicating that replacement of tiles with shingles failed to comply with the Unified Design Guidelines and that the alteration was out of character with the residence and the district. Commissioners Schoell and Turner both commented that a proactive effort to share the process and rationale with the Board of Adjustment prior to the review would be important.

D. New Business

None

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

None

F. Public Comment

None

G. Adjournment

Commissioner Schoell adjourned the Regular Meeting at 5:10 P.M.