



TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, October 25, 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 4:35 P.M.

Members Present

James Turner, AIA, Chair
Holly Becker, Vice-Chair
Katelyn Parker, RA, Secretary
Royce Ellington
Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS
Mark Sanders

Members Absent

Chris Bumgarner
Geoffery Evans, PLA, ASLA
Susan McKee, MFA*
Ted A. Reeds II, AIA
Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D.

Staff Present

Felicity Good, Robi Jones, Audrey Blank*

Others Present

Keith Martin, Austin Bond

*Late Arrival

2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, October 13, 2022

Commissioner Parker made a motion to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting on October 13, 2022. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and approved with a majority.

Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, October 13, 2022

In Favor

- 1. Turner
- 2. Becker
- 3. Parker
- 4. Ellington
- 5. Grant

Opposed

Abstaining

Sanders

Not Present

Bumgarner
Evans
McKee
Reeds
Townsend

3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

None

B. Actionable Items

1. **HP-0400-2022 / 1103 E. 19th St.** (North Maple Ridge)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: October 18, 2022

Applicant: Austin Bond

Proposal:

1. Relocation of recessed wall, door, and window on north façade
2. Installation of awning on north façade
3. Installation of light fixture on north façade

Staff directed commissioners' attention to Section 70.070-F of the Tulsa Zoning Code and afterwards presented its report, noting that the applicant brought some additional plans to the meeting and could answer questions. Commissioner Turner asked the applicant if he had anything to add to staff's presentation. The applicant, Austin Bond, did not have anything to add to staff's report. Commissioner Turner asked the applicant if he had considered extending the brick into the new wall instead of constructing the wall with the proposed stucco. Mr. Bond explained that they were trying to match the original design of the service porch, as it used to be called, and it was stucco. Mr. Bond also noted that the stucco would allow the original wood post to be retained and would prevent them from having to remove masonry to weave new brick into the wall. Commissioner Turner asked the applicant if he was going to be able to save the existing door. Mr. Bond stated that they are going to do their best to save the existing door but if they could not, they would save the original hardware to be used on a new door and, because they have the original plans, he felt confident that a new door would look the same as the original door. Commissioner Sanders stated that he was present at the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee's review of the application and thought that the project embodied a lot of the principles of restoration and preservation that they look for, such as the reuse and repurposing of the original fixtures by moving them and the use of stucco rather than trying to match the brick. He felt the proposal completely honored the original intent of the space and stated that the subcommittee was enthusiastic in their support. Commissioner Ellington stated that the subcommittee had some concerns about the door, but they appreciated that the air conditioning units would be moved. Commissioner Grant stated that the application did not say anything about replacing the door so he would make a motion to approve the application as presented and then if the applicant needed to replace the door, he could come back with a new application. Mr. Bond stated that he would appreciate it if the commission considered the option of replacing the door in order to save time. Commissioner Turner mentioned the additional plans that the applicant brought to the meeting addressed the door. Commissioner Parker asked the applicant if the proposed replacement door would be an aluminum-clad door and the applicant responded that it was a wood door. Commissioner Grant asked about the transom window over the door and Mr. Bond explained that it had been removed some time ago. Commissioner Parker asked Mr. Bond if he knew who the original architect was, and Mr. Bond replied that he did not remember his name, but he was from Cleveland, Ohio. Commissioner Grant asked the applicant if the proposed replacement door by Anderson Windows and Doors features simulated divided lights. After some explanation of what was meant by simulated divided-light, Mr. Bond responded that they would make sure the replacement door has true divided lights.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application as presented with the replacement of the door and with the condition that the door have true divided lights. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sanders 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.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.7.1, E.1.1, E.1.2, E.1.3, E.1.4

Vote: 1103 E. 19th St. (North Maple Ridge)

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

2. HP-0401-2022 / 1332 E. 18th St. (Swan Lake)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: October 18, 2022

Applicants: Keith and Sasha Martin

Proposal:

1. Replacement of retaining wall

Application to amend previous approval of HP-0273-2021 by Tulsa Preservation Commission on August 12, 2021

Staff presented its report, noting that the applicant, Keith Martin, was present and could answer questions. Commissioner Turner asked the applicant if he had anything to add to staff's report. Mr. Martin replied that the shadows from the sun were dramatic and made it difficult to capture the stone in photographs. He added that he provided several options for the types of stones to be used for the retaining wall and asked if the commissioners would give a "yes or no" for each one. Commissioner Turner answered that they are not good at giving options then asked if they are all natural stones. Mr. Martin answered affirmatively. Commissioner Becker gave the report from the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. She stated that they agreed that the stone was an improvement over the previously approved Redi-Rock gravity wall system but since no builder or architect was present at the subcommittee meeting, they wanted to advance the application the Tulsa Preservation Commission so that they full commission could see the engineering drawings and weigh in on the actual choice of stone. Commissioner Sanders asked the other commissioners if they thought the existing retaining wall was the original stone. Mr. Martin said the mason thought it looked like it was limestone from a quarry in Indiana and could have been scrap material from what was used in the National Mall in Washington, D.C. Commissioner Grant stated that since there was no certainty that it was original, they should be paying attention to what would be most appropriate for the neighborhood, and he thought that would be Option Four (4) because it was a little more organized. Commissioner Grant asked the applicant if they were going to be putting on a capstone, and Mr. Martin answered affirmatively. Commissioner Turner agreed that he also preferred option 4 (four) because it was more traditional, and Commissioner Sanders agreed that Option Four (4) had a formal appearance that was consistent with the style of the residence. Commissioner Grant pointed out that the engineering drawings were not showing a capstone, but the wall needed one to cover up the core

concrete and it was an important detail. Commissioner Turner stated that the cap should be a minimum of four inches (0'-4") thick with a one-inch (0'-1") overhang.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Parker made a motion to approve the replacement of retaining wall with Stone Option #4 and with the condition that the wall have a matching cap that covers the concrete section, is 4" in height, and has a 1" overhang. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellington and approved unanimously.

Guidelines cited: A.1.1, A.1.2, A.1.3, A.1.4, G.1.1, G.1.2, G.1.3, G.1.4, G.1.5

Vote: 1332 E. 18th St. (Swan Lake)

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

3. HP-0395-2022 / 1528 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Dates: October 6, 2022; October 18, 2022

Applicant: Nathan Moseley

Proposal:

1. Replacement of windows

Project completed without an historic preservation permit

Staff presented its report, noting that the applicants were not present at the Tulsa Preservation Commission meeting. Commissioner Becker gave a report from the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. She stated that they had some difficulty assessing the request for replacement windows because the applicants were not present at either subcommittee meeting; therefore, they were not able to ask specific questions about the existing windows, which had already been removed prior to their application for an historic preservation permit. Commissioner Becker added that there was not great deal of enthusiasm about the vinyl windows, and it was not easy to tell from the photos what kind of windows had been there previously.

Commissioner Sanders had also been at the recent Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee meeting and added that one of the hardest things the preservation commission has to deal with is when someone pulls windows out before they seek an historic preservation permit. If they pull wood windows, then they should replace them with wood windows. Commissioner Sanders went on to say that it seemed credible, based on some archival photos from Google Maps, that the front-facing windows were probably aluminum at the time that the historic preservation overlay was established in Swan Lake. He also noted that the installed vinyl windows were a dramatic improvement over aluminum windows, so they were willing to support the request although they wrestled with the decision. Commissioner Ellington stated that the house looked better compared to how it looked before. Commissioner Turner asked Staff if the applicants indicated if that they were all the existing openings and if they replaced any trim. Staff stated that they did not indicate what the trim was previously. Commissioner Turner stated that he saw a water table on the back window, but he did not see it on any of the other windows. Staff stated that looking at

the photo from 1995, it was hard to tell what the bottom of the windows looked like, but it appeared that it had the same trim around the tops. Commissioner Turner stated that the proportion of the windows was not the worst, but the construction of them was not good. Commissioner Parker added that the windows are too flat and do not have a shadow line profile. Commissioner Sanders mentioned that the subcommittee had discussed requiring the applicant to add some muntins but decided that it would probably make the windows look worse because it would make it more obvious that they were poor replacements. After discussion about the possible options for moving forward with the application and the precedent that they would be setting if they approved the windows just because they had already been installed, the commissioners agreed that they could not, in good conscience, approve the application due to the fact that the replacement windows do not meet the Unified Design Guidelines. Commissioner Sanders also noted that it was unclear whether any original windows visible from the street had been replaced. Commissioners specifically mentioned Guidelines A.4.1, A.4.3, A.4.4, A.4.5, A.4.6, A.4.7, and A.1.2.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Parker made a motion to deny the proposal for the replacement of windows because they do not meet the Unified Design Guidelines: A.4.1, A.4.3, A.4.4, A.4.5, A.4.6, A.4.7, and A.1.2. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sanders and passed unanimously.

Vote: 1528 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)

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

4. Review and approval of letter in support of the preservation of the Tulsa Skyride at Expo Square

Staff presented the letter, and commissioners expressed support for submitting it to the Tulsa County Public Facilities Authority. Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the letter as written and send it to the TCPFA. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellington and passed unanimously.

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

C. Reports

1. Staff Report

Staff reported that the Tracy Park Historic Preservation Overlay would be heard by the Urban and Economic Development committee the following day and then would

be scheduled for a first reading at the Tulsa City Council meeting on November 2, 2022. Staff gave updates on cases of work completed without historic preservation permits at 1601 South Detroit Avenue, 1624 South Norfolk Avenue, 1616 South Quincy Avenue, 1747 South Quincy Avenue, and 1839 East 17th Street. Staff reported on one staff-approved historic preservation permit:

a. **1820 East 17th Street (HP-0402-2022)**

Removal of non-historic metal louvers over windows

2. Chair Report

None

D. New Business

None

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

None

F. Public Comment

G. Adjournment

Commissioner Turner adjourned the Regular Meeting at 5:37 P.M.