



**TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**Thursday, October 13, 2022, 11:00 A.M.**

City Hall @ One Technology Center, 175 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
10th Floor, North Conference Room

A. Opening Matters

1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum

Commissioner Turner called the Regular Meeting to order at 11:06 A.M.

**Members Present**

James Turner, AIA, Chair  
Holly Becker, Vice-Chair  
Katelyn Parker, RA, Secretary  
Geoffery Evans, PLA, ASLA  
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS  
Susan McKee, MFA\*  
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.

**Members Absent**

Chris Bumgarner  
Royce Ellington  
Ted A. Reeds II, AIA  
Mark Sanders

**Staff Present**

Felicity Good, Robi Jones, Audrey Blank

**Others Present**

John Spillyards, Douglas Peck

\*Late Arrival

2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 8, 2022

Commissioner Townsend made a motion to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting on September 8, 2022. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Evans and approved unanimously.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 8, 2022

**In Favor**

1. Turner
2. Becker
3. Parker
4. Evans
5. Grant
6. Townsend

**Opposed**

**Abstaining**

**Not Present**

Bumgarner  
Ellington  
McKee  
Reeds  
Sanders

Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 27, 2022

Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting on September 27, 2022. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Townsend and approved with a majority.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, September 27, 2022

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

3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest  
None

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0391-2022 / 657 N. Cheyenne Ave.** (The Heights/Brady Heights)

Applicant: Douglas Peck

Proposal:

1. Replacement of windows

Staff directed commissioners' attention to Section 70.070-F of the Tulsa Zoning Code and afterwards presented its report, noting that the applicant was present and could answer questions. Commissioner Turner asked the applicant if he had anything to add to staff's presentation. The applicant, Douglas Peck, stated that he was requesting to replace nine (9) windows due to damage caused by condensation. Mr. Peck explained that he has had to replace the glass in the windows approximately every three years, which costs approximately \$400 a window. He stated that even after replacing the glass numerous times, he was still experiencing problems with condensation, so he proposed to replace all the aluminum windows with vinyl windows. Commissioner Turner asked staff if the Tulsa Preservation Commission had previously approved the aluminum windows because the guidelines were not the same when the house was first constructed. Staff replied that the guidelines for The Heights say to match the original historic window material, but on new construction, other materials have been approved. Commissioner Parker stated that the presence of condensation would indicate that the seal around the glass is breaking, and another insulated window could still have the same problem. Commissioner Parker added that the proposed vinyl windows would probably be better than the existing aluminum windows. Commissioner Townsend thanked the applicant for putting together such a nice and thorough proposal. Commissioner Becker gave a report about the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee's recommendations and stated that the application was reviewed at two separate subcommittee meetings. The main discussion had been about aluminum windows versus vinyl windows. Ultimately, the subcommittee had advanced the application to the Tulsa Preservation Commission to decide whether the vinyl windows would be a suitable replacement for the aluminum windows. Commissioner Parker stated that the existing aluminum windows were skinny and flat, and she felt that the proposed vinyl windows would look better. Commissioner Parker asked the applicant if he had considered double-hung windows because they have a better shadow line and would allow for better circulation since both the top and bottom of the windows could be opened. Mr. Peck answered that he needed to stick to his budget and the double-hung windows would not be affordable.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to approve the application for the replacement of windows as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Evans and approved 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, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4

**Vote: 657 N. Cheyenne Ave.** (The Heights/Brady Heights)

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

2. **HP-0398-2022 / 625 N. Cheyenne Ave.** (The Heights/Brady Heights)

Applicant: Jeremy Brennan

Proposal:

1. Replacement of square balusters with turned balusters on porch rail

Staff presented its report, noting that an historic preservation permit had been issued by staff for the repair and replacement in-kind of several other elements on the porch. The applicant was not present. Commissioner Turner asked Staff if the turned balusters were already existing on the rail set. Staff answered that they were existing but at some point, a few of them had been replaced with square balusters and now the applicant wants to replace the square balusters with turned balusters so they all match. Commissioner Turner asked staff if the rail was original. Staff answered that it was possible and stated that it had been there, as evidenced in an available photo, since at least 2001. Commissioner Turner followed up by asking if it could have been approved by staff as a replacement in-kind. Staff answered that it could not have been because the request was to replace the square balusters with turned balusters. Commissioner Grant theorized that the original rail probably had the square balusters. Commissioner Parker stated that the Victorian style of the home made it more likely that the original balusters were turned but it was difficult to tell without inspecting them up close.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the replacement of square balusters with turned balusters on the porch rail as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Parker and approved unanimously.

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: 625 N. Cheyenne Ave.** (The Heights/Brady Heights)

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Turner			Bumgarner
2. Becker			Ellington

3. Parker
4. Evans
5. Grant
6. Townsend

McKee  
Reeds  
Sanders

3. **HP-0388-2022 / 1110 N. Cheyenne Ave.** (The Heights/Brady Heights)

Applicant: Giles Gregory

Proposals:

1. Replacement of columns on porch
2. Replacement of rail on porch
3. Replacement of floor on porch
4. Replacement of foundation on porch
5. Replacement of light fixture on porch

*Alteration of approved proposal completed without an historic preservation permit*

Staff presented its report, noting that the applicants do not live in town and could not be present. Commissioner Turner stated that he was at the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee meeting and gave a report. The subcommittee requested that the railing be lowered to below the caps on the piers and that a capital be placed around the top of the columns. Commissioner Turner reported that the subcommittee felt the use of split-faced concrete blocks for the foundation and piers was a modern interpretation of rusticated block, which is a historic material, and therefore was acceptable. The subcommittee recommended approval with the conditions that:

- *the top of the column be capped with a 2 x 2 trim,*
- *a detail drawing of the column with dimensions be submitted,*
- *the rail be rebuilt to shorten it to at or below the pilaster cap, and*
- *the balusters not be placed in front of the top and bottom rail.*

Commissioner Grant stated that the header looked bizarre to him. Commissioners Turner and Parker agreed, but Commissioner Turner noted that had been an existing condition previously. Commissioner Parker added that, although the replacement in-kind of the columns had been approved, it did not appear that the previous columns were original to the house.

The meeting was temporarily paused for a fire alarm at 11:30 A.M. Staff and commissioners exited the building. Upon return, Commissioner McKee arrived, and Commissioner Turner called the meeting back to order at 11:56 A.M.

Commissioner Grant verified with Staff that the boards on the porch were replaced with three quarters of an inch (0'- $\frac{3}{4}$ " ) thick pine tongue-and-groove boards, and staff answered affirmatively. Commissioner Parker stated that she had a problem with the rail as constructed, as well as with the use of the split-faced, concrete blocks for the stem wall and piers. She also commented that the columns are not located in the right place and that they stick out too far. In response to a question from Commissioner Evans, Commissioner Parker stated that it appeared the columns were now off-center from the corners. Commissioner Grant stated that the column could have been tapered to improve its proportions and asked whether the split-faced block on the stem wall was a veneer. Staff replied that she originally had thought it was a veneer but that the applicants confirmed the blocks were structurally part of the porch foundation. Commissioner Parker stated that she would support the light fixture and the porch floor but nothing else. Commissioner Grant agreed with Commissioner Parker about the light fixture and the porch floor and observed the large space between the bottom of the rail and the porch floor, but Commissioner Turner clarified that the porch floor was difficult to see because it had been painted black. Commissioner Grant stated that, traditionally, the top rail should be placed

underneath the caps on the piers. Commissioner Parker suggested that the applicant could consider applying stucco to the split-faced block on the piers, and Commissioner Townsend wondered if it would be appropriate also apply stucco to the split-faced blocks on the stem wall. Commissioner Turner doubted that stucco could be applied to the block. Commissioner Grant indicated acceptance of the split-faced block on the stem wall but not the piers. Commissioner Parker stated that historic, rusticated rock face block was present on columns on residences from the same time period and expressed disappointment that the elements on the porch had not been replaced in-kind as they should have been. Upon a question from Commissioner Evans, Staff stated that the applicant had indicated that the changes to the approved proposal were a result of communication issues with their contractor. Commissioner Parker suggested that the preservation commission consider Item 3: Replacement of floor on porch and Item 5: Replacement of light fixture on porch separately and then move forward with the remaining items. Commissioner Grant recommended that Item 1: Replacement of columns on porch and Item 2: Replacement of rail on porch be denied and that the applicants present a new proposal to the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee.

Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve Item 3: Replacement of floor on the porch and Item 5: Replacement of light fixture on porch. Commissioner Evans suggested reducing the height of the piers, and Commissioner Parker stated that the material rather than the height and shape of the piers was her primary concern. Commissioner Evans asked whether the material had been approved previously, and Commissioner Turner replied that the split-faced block might have been approved on a foundation wall but that he could not recall any instances in which the preservation commission approved the material for use on a porch or columns. Commissioner Parker could not recall the approval of split-faced block on a residence at all. Commissioner Grant amended his motion to approve Item 3: Replacement of floor on the porch, Item 4: Replacement of porch foundation, and Item 5: Replacement of light fixture on porch. Commissioner Evans suggested clarifying in the motion that the approval would not apply to any part of the columns or piers. Commissioner Townsend asked for clarification about the foundation of the porch and then suggested removing that item from the motion since the material was the same as the columns. Commissioner Grant agreed that it should be discussed further and amended his motion to approve Item 3: Replacement of floor on the porch and Item 5: Replacement of light fixture on porch. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Townsend and approved unanimously.

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: 1110 N. Cheyenne Ave. (The Heights/Brady Heights)**

- 3. Replacement of floor on porch
- 5. Replacement of light fixture on porch

**In Favor**

- 1. Turner
- 2. Becker

**Opposed**

**Abstaining**

**Not Present**

- Bumgarner
- Ellington

- |             |         |
|-------------|---------|
| 3. Parker   | Reeds   |
| 4. Evans    | Sanders |
| 5. Grant    |         |
| 6. McKee    |         |
| 7. Townsend |         |

Commissioner Parker made a motion to deny Item 1: Replacement of columns on the porch, Item 2: Replacement of rail on porch, and Item 4: Replacement of foundation on porch. Commissioner Townsend asked whether the items should be referred to subcommittee, but Commissioner Parker disagreed, stating that the application had been reviewed twice by the subcommittee with little response. Commissioner Turner noted that the applicants had responded to the subcommittee's recommendations but had taken exception with some of the recommendations. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Townsend and approved.

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: 1110 N. Cheyenne Ave. (The Heights/Brady Heights)**

1. Replacement of columns on porch
2. Replacement of rail on porch
4. Replacement of foundation on porch

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

Commissioner Evans asked what the next step was for the applicant, and Commissioner Turner explained that the applicant could submit as many new applications as needed, as long as they were different than previous applications. It was also noted that the applicant could appeal their decision to the Board of Adjustment or, if they chose to do nothing and ignore the denial, Staff would turn the case over to Code Enforcement. Commissioners Parker and Evans asked Staff if the applicant had applied for a permit for the stairs and newly installed sidewalk. Staff answered that they had not, but Staff would let them know that they needed to complete an application for those items.

**4. Review and approval of the 2023 regular meeting schedule of the Tulsa Preservation Commission and Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee**

Staff presented the proposed 2023 regular meeting schedule of the Tulsa Preservation Commission and Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee.

Commissioner Townsend made a motion to approve the 2023 regular meeting schedule of the Tulsa Preservation Commission and Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and passed unanimously.

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

4. Evans
5. Grant
6. McKee
7. Townsend

Sanders

C. Reports

1. Staff Report

Staff reported that they had given a presentation to the Owen Park Neighborhood Association on October 2, 2022. Staff then reported that the proposed Tracy Park Historic Preservation Overlay had been recommended for approval by the planning commission and would be heard by the city council next. Staff will inform the preservation commission about the city council meeting dates, and Commissioner Becker suggested that someone from the commission attend those meetings.

Staff updated the commissioners on Work completed without an historic preservation permit at 1528 South St. Louis Avenue, 1601 South Detroit Avenue, and 1624 South Norfolk Avenue.

Staff reported on new cases of Work completed without an historic preservation permit at 1616 South Quincy Avenue, 1747 South Quincy Avenue, 1820 East 17<sup>th</sup> Street, 1839 East 17<sup>th</sup> Street, and 1864 East 17<sup>th</sup> Street.

Staff reported on a completed project at 1211 East 18<sup>th</sup> Street. The new front doors had been installed.

Staff reported on staff-approved historic preservation permits at two locations:

- a. **1725 South Peoria Avenue (HP-0396-2022)**  
Replacement in-kind of siding on north façade  
Repair and replacement in-kind of trim on north façade
- b. **625 North Cheyenne Avenue (HP-0397-2022)**  
Repair and replacement in-kind of structural elements on porch  
Replacement in-kind of porch floor with 1 X 4 tongue-and-groove boards  
Replacement in-kind of trim around rim joists and under deck boards on porch  
Repair and replacement in-kind of damaged elements on porch rail

2. Chair Report

None

D. New Business  
None

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items  
None

F. Public Comment  
Staff shared a letter from Steven Wilson concerning the possible auction of the Tulsa Skyride at Expo Square. Commissioners directed Staff to draft a letter of support for the Skyride and present it at the next meeting for review and approval.

- G. Adjournment  
Commissioner Turner adjourned the Regular Meeting at 12:23 P.M.