TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, November 14, 2019, 11:00 A.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 11:05 A.M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present</th>
<th>Members Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David W. Schoell, P.E., Chair</td>
<td>Ted A. Reeds, II, AIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS, Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Jones, Secretary*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Becker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris J. Bumgarner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan J. McKee, MFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katelyn C. Parker, RA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Shears, ASLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E. Turner, AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Present</th>
<th>Others Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roy M. (Jed) Porter, Jr., Audrey Blank, Felicity O. Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Araskog</td>
<td>Shea Otley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Werneke</td>
<td>Ryan Scamehorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea Otley</td>
<td>Aaron Sprik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katelyn C. Parker, RA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, October 22, 2019
   Commissioner Bumgarner made a motion to approve the Minutes subject to the
   correction of members in favor and not present for Actionable Item 5: The 2020
   Regular Meeting Schedule. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and
   was approved by majority.
Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, October 22, 2019

In Favor: Schoell
Opposed: Becker
Abstaining: McKee
Not Present: Jones

In Favor: Grant
Opposed: Reeds
Abstaining: Townsend

In Favor: Bumgarner
Opposed: Parker
Abstaining: Shears
Not Present: Turner

In Favor: Parker
Opposed: Shears
Abstaining: Turner
Not Present: Reeds

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

B. Actionable Items
1. Nomination of Fire Station No. 13 to the National Register of Historic Places

Sara R. Werneke, National Register of Historic Places Program Coordinator for the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office, presented a nomination for Fire Station No. 13, located at 3924 West Charles Page Boulevard. According to Ms. Werneke, Fire Station No. 13 was nominated for the local level of significance under Criterion A in Community Planning and Development, and Criterion C in Architecture. Ms. Werneke cited Fire Station No. 13 as an example of the Zigzag Art Deco style. Commissioner Schoell inquired about the station’s future, and Ms. Werneke replied that Fire Station No. 13 would be the subject of a project benefitting from historic preservation tax credits.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Parker made a motion to find Fire Station No. 13 eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and recommend its eligibility to the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office and to the National Park Service. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and approved unanimously.

Vote: Nomination of Fire Station No. 13 to the National Register of Historic Places

In Favor: Schoell
Opposed: Reeds
Abstaining: Townsend
Not Present: Reeds

In Favor: Grant
Opposed: Townsend
Abstaining: McKee
Not Present: Reeds

In Favor: Bumgarner
Opposed: Parker
Abstaining: Shears
Not Present: Turner

In Favor: Parker
Opposed: Shears
Abstaining: Turner
Not Present: Reeds

2
2. **HP-0142-2019 / 1131 E. 20th St.** (North Maple Ridge)

Applicant: David Z. Carman

Proposal:
1. Replacement of three windows on north façade with a single window
2. Replacement of three windows on east façade with two windows

**Unapproved Alteration of an Approved Proposal**

Application to amend previous approval of an application by Tulsa Preservation Commission on March 14, 2019

Staff presented its report, noting that the alteration was prompted by changes to the floor plan. Commissioner Grant reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee conducted a careful review, and although the changes were unapproved, the removed windows were used and the bathroom windows matched those that existed on the house’s east side. The subcommittee forwarded the application to the commission with a recommendation of approval. The applicant’s representative added that they had strived to maintain the home’s integrity by using elements from the original house. Commissioner Parker inquired about the portè-cochere, and the applicant stated the Work completed on the portè-cochere was approved through a separate application. Commissioner Turner pointed out that the second-story window on the home’s north façade did not align with the window directly below it on the first story. Commissioner Shears commented that the first story windows were not visible from the street.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Shears and was approved by majority. Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, B.1.1, B.1.2, B.1.3, B.3.1, B.3.3, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4

**Vote:** 1131 E. 20th St. (North Maple Ridge)

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

3. **HP-0144-2019 / 1535 S. Norfolk Ave.** (North Maple Ridge)

Applicants: Roonie Leittem-Murrell and Joseph W. Murrell, Jr.

Proposal:
1. Replacement of retaining wall

Staff presented its report, noting that the failing retaining wall posed a safety hazard. According to staff, the application was forwarded directly to the Tulsa Preservation Commission without review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. The applicant, Ms. Leittem-Murrell, provided a sample of the Olde Manor retaining wall blocks to be used. Commissioner Parker asked whether the blocks would be mortared together, and Ms. Leittem-Murrell replied that they would be held together
with rods. Mr. Murrell added that a French drain would be installed for water drainage. Upon inquiries from Commissioners Shears and Grant, Mr. Murrell stated the concrete footing would not be replaced. Commissioner Parker stated that an interlocking system could conflict with the Unified Design Guideline’s prohibition of segmental retaining walls. The commissioners expressed concern about the wall’s structural integrity and informed the applicants that a structural engineer would need to design and inspect the wall and a permit from the City of Tulsa would be required. Commissioner Turner requested information on the treatment of the cap, and Commissioner McKee expressed interest in the treatment of the bulkhead along the driveway. Commissioner Schoell added that the elevation displayed a cap, but the section did not. Commissioner Turner offered the opinion that the material itself was an improvement from the existing wall, but Commissioner Shears expressed concern about the structure and ongoing maintenance that would be required. Commissioner Turner recommended continuing the item to allow the applicant time to consult an engineer and provide details on the wall’s dimensions, cap, and treatment of the bulkhead.

As there was no discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to continue the review to allow the applicant time to provide additional information on the wall cap, returns shown on the renderings, and dimensions of the arrangement. The applicant agreed to continue review until the November 22, 2019 or the December 12, 2019 Regular Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Shears and approved unanimously. Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, 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: 1535 S. Norfolk Ave. (North Maple Ridge)

In Favor  Opposed  Abstaining  Not Present
1. Schoell  
2. Grant  
3. Jones  
4. Becker  
5. Bumgarner  
6. McKee  
7. Parker  
8. Shears  
9. Turner  

4. HP-0130-2019 / 2216 E. 17th St. (Yorktown)

Applicant: Biltmore Homes
Proposal:
1. Construction of residence

Staff presented its report, noting that the proposal was inspired by the Georgian style. According to staff, the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee reviewed the proposal twice and recommended several revisions to add refinement and symmetry to the façade. Commissioner Grant reported that the subcommittee worked extensively to align the windows and standardize their sizes, and the subcommittee forwarded the application with a recommendation of approval. The applicant noted
the need to alter the second-story window on the right side of the right elevation to align with the window directly below it. The applicant made requests to relocate the belt course and to increase the width of the door from thirty-six inches (36") to forty-two inches (42"). After an inquiry from Commissioner Grant, the applicant confirmed that the first floor would be at least one foot (1'-0") above grade, with two six-inch (6") or eight-inch (8") steps leading to the front porch. The applicant clarified that the belt course should run level with the beginning of the second floor, rather than the ten-foot (10'-0") plate height of the first floor. Commissioner Parker asked about the placement of utilities, and the applicant indicated that the air conditioning units would be placed in the back half of the lot's east side. After questions from Commissioners Schoell and Parker, the applicant stated that the painted king brick would cover the façade and Hardie Plank lap siding would cover the dormers. The applicant noted the subcommittee's recommendation to cover the garage addition with siding, but neighborhood covenants required full masonry on the first floor of the home. Commissioner Parker inquired about the height of historic structures along the same street. Commissioner McKee stated that across the street were single-story homes, but the Gillette Historic District contained some two-story homes. The applicant replied that the scale of the house matched the other homes within Barnard Trace. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner McKee, the applicant stated that if a fireplace were installed on the covered patio, its chimney would not be visible from the street. Commissioner Schoell expressed approval of the request to widen the door.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the application with the increase in the door’s width to forty-two inches (42"), the alteration of the belt course to align with the transition from the first to the second floor, and the alignment of the first- and second-floor windows on the right side of the west façade. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bumgarner and was approved by majority. Guidelines cited: C.1.1, C.1.2, C.1.3, C.1.4, C.1.5, C.1.6, C.2.1, C.2.2, C.2.3, C.2.4, C.2.5, C.2.6, C.4.1, C.4.2, C.4.3, C.4.4, C.5.1, C.5.2, C.5.3, C.5.4

Vote: 2216 E. 17th St. (Yorktown)

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

5. **HP-0134-2019 / 2209 E. 17th Pl. (Yorktown)**

Applicant: Creative Home Designs
Proposal:
1. Construction of residence

Staff presented its report, explaining the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee’s acceptance of the metal roof accent above the porch and on the
dormers during its second review and its recommendation to propose an asphalt roof as an alternative. Commissioner Turner gave a report, noting that the windows would be surrounded in cast stone. Commissioner Turner relayed that the applicants had been advised against metal roofing at the first subcommittee review, but at the second review Commissioners Turner and Grant approved of the metal as an accent element on the house. According to Commissioner Turner, the subcommittee recommended a stucco exterior for the garage addition. Commissioner Grant added that the subcommittee had recommended the one-story garage addition to be recessed. Upon inquiries, the applicant stated the roof would be a standing-seam, bronze-colored metal roof. Commissioner Shears noted that the right window on the front façade appeared to be out of scale with the others, and Commissioner Parker noted that no pre-cast stone was shown around the front door or the two dormer windows. The applicant stated that they would like to add stone around the door and could remove the stone trim from the second-story window. Commissioner McKee commented about the proportion of the front door with the windows, and the applicant stated the door would be three feet (3'-0") wide and eight feet (8'-0") tall. Commissioner Parker recommended three (3) divisions on the front left window, and Commissioner Turner noted that the front right windows appeared to be wider than the front door. The applicant stated the windows could be modified to be three feet (3'-0") wide and six feet (6'-0") high. Commissioner Parker stated the side windows should be the same dimensions. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Schoell, the applicant confirmed that painted king brick would be used, and Commissioner Parker recommended unpainted brick to give the cast stone more visibility.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions:
1. That standing-seam metal be used as a roofing accent element;
2. That the front windows be three feet (3'-0") by six feet (6'-0") to match the width of the front door;
3. That the windows on the left elevation match the dimensions of the front windows;
4. That the front door be framed in cast stone;
5. That the cast stone framing be removed from the second-story recessed window on the right side; and
6. That a vertical division be added on the first-story left front window to match the front windows to the right of the door.


Vote:  2209 E. 17th Pl. (Yorktown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schoell</td>
<td>McKee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumgarner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   Applicant: Around Oklahoma Investments
   Proposal:
   1. Removal of retaining wall and adjustment of grade
   2. Removal of two windows on first story of south façade and installation of two windows
   3. Replacement of two windows on second story of south façade with a single window
   4. Replacement of two windows on second story of north façade with a single window
   5. Installation of Craftsman Style Lamp on porch
   6. Replacement of door

Staff presented its report, adding that the retaining wall had been removed due to a miscommunication with the contractor. The applicants were not present. Staff reported that Commissioners Reeds and Townsend had been present during the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee review and forwarded the application with a recommendation for approval. Commissioner Parker inquired about the window with diamond divisions, and staff replied that it had not been presented to the subcommittee. Staff clarified that most windows on the house would be repaired, but the window changes were proposed to accommodate changes to the program. Commissioner Parker expressed disapproval of the replacement of the second-story windows, as the balance of windows on all sides was a character-defining feature of an airplane bungalow. Commissioner McKee agreed and expressed concern about egress. Commissioner Jones also agreed, stating the proposed configuration appeared unbalanced and did not show regard for the home’s historic elements. Commissioner Shears recommended referring the application to the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee for a second review, and Commissioner Grant agreed, noting the commission lacked answers to several questions. Commissioner Parker suggested approving some items on the application and denying others. Commissioner Grant asked if the front door would have panels. Commissioner Parker expressed the opinion that removing the windows was an error, and Commissioner Jones agreed.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Parker made a motion to refer items 3 and 4 to the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee and to approve items 1, 2, 5, and 6 with the condition that the front door have a panel as shown in the front elevation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and was approved by majority. Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, A.3.3, A.3.8, A.3.9, A.4.1, A.4.2, A.4.5, A.4.6, A.4.7, G.1.1, G.1.2, G.1.3
C. Discussion of Policy for Response to Failure to Respond to Letter of Notification and to Lack of Compliance with Unified Design Guidelines

Staff provided a draft policy for the Tulsa Preservation Commission’s response to situations in which owners fail to respond to notifications of violation or disapproval of Historic Preservation Permit applications. Staff reported that the draft policy included recording Letters of Notification in the County Clerk’s land records if homeowners failed to respond within a specified period. Commissioner Turner asked if a fine could be issued, and Legal Staff replied that property owners could face penalties for violations of the Tulsa Zoning Code but that citations were resolved in municipal court, where prosecutors decided on the fines. Legal Staff also clarified that the Working in Neighborhoods Department’s approach was to notify property owners and work with them to comply with the Tulsa Zoning Code before issuing citations. Commissioner Turner recommended adding a statement in the policy expressing that a violation of the zoning code could be subject to a fine. Commissioner Parker inquired about the effects of recording letters of notification in the County Clerk’s land records, and Legal Staff stated this would result in a cloud in title. Commissioner Jones stated that the letters would not be an issue with some title insurance companies if the punishment was not monetary. Commissioner Turner expressed favor for the draft policy but requested the inclusion of a statement in notifications to homeowners that fines would be pursued. Commissioner Parker agreed with the draft policy, and Commissioner Grant stated he hoped to form a committee to build a strategy for responding to violations.
Staff reminded the commission of the upcoming holiday party immediately following the last annual meeting of the Tulsa Preservation Commission on December 12, 2019.

D. New Business
   None

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items
   None

F. Public Comment
   None

G. Adjournment
   Commissioner Schoell adjourned the Regular Meeting at 1:13 P.M.