

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF
May 7, 2018**

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met for the Regular Meeting on May 7, 2018, at 6:30 p.m. Notice and Agenda of the meeting were posted at 201 West Gray Building A, the Norman Municipal Building and at www.Normanok.gov twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair David John called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

Item No. 1, being: Roll Call.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Cameron Brewer
Anna Eddings
Erinn Gavaghan
David John
Russell Kaplan
Glen Roberson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jim Gasaway
Greg Heiser
Emily Wilkins

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Anaïs Starr, Planner II
Jolana McCart, Admin Tech IV
Jeanne Snider, Asst City Attorney

GUESTS: Linda Ozan, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Sara Werneke, Historic Preservation Specialist
Cynthia Savage
Curtis McCarty
Paul Johnston

Item No. 2, being: Approval of the Agenda.

Motion by R Kaplan for approval of the Agenda; **Second** by G Roberson. All approve.

Item No. 3, being: Approval of Minutes from the March 5, 2018 Regular Meeting.

(It was noted that the Agenda stated the minutes as being from the April 2nd meeting instead of the March 5th meeting.)

Motion by R Kaplan for approval of the minutes; **Second** by A Eddings. All approve.

Item No. 4, being: Consideration of nomination to the National Register of Historic Places for the area known as Southridge Historic District including generally the streets located between Classen Boulevard and Oklahoma Avenue from Macy Street on the north of Okmulgee on the south.

Linda Ozan, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer of the SHPO, explained that the National Park Service and thus the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office requires all nominations to the National Registry for Historic Places be reviewed at a public hearing before the local Historic District Commission. Upon a recommendation from the local HDC, the nomination will be considered at the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Commission meeting on July 19, 2018.

Cynthia Savage, with Architectural Resources and Community Heritage Consulting, prepared the nomination for the Southridge Historic District. The National Register Nomination of the district is being submitted under Criterion C, Architecture, with the Period of Significance being from 1922 to 1959. Ms. Savage explained that at least 51% of the homes in a proposed National Historic District had to be contributing structures. The area contains 55 contributing structures and 17 non-contributing structures, equaling a 76% contribution rate.

G Roberson stated that the correct term was “Register” not “Registry”, as was stated in the Staff Report.

Motion by R Kaplan to approve the nomination to the NRHP; **Second** by G Roberson. All approve.

Item No. 5, being: Consideration of a petition to delist the Debarr Historic District from the National Register of Historic Places which includes the streets of Deans Row, Jenkins, Monnet, Eddington and McCullough, all located between Asp and the railroad tracks and from Boyd to Duffy.

Linda Ozan explained that the National Park Service and thus the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office requires all delisting requests from the National Registry for Historic Places be reviewed at a public hearing before the local Historic District Commission. While a property generally remains on the National Register of Historic Places even if it does lose its historic integrity, any person can petition to have a property delisted.

Last fall Debarr Street was renamed Deans Row Avenue. At that time it was also desired by a group of citizens to have the District renamed. After research and discussion, it was deemed that the District could not be renamed if it was no longer eligible to be on the National Register. David Chunn, Survey Coordinator with the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office, determined that the area no longer met the criteria to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It was found that the District has declined from 72% of the structures having historic integrity in 1991 to 43% of the structures in 2018. (51% is required).

C Brewer stated that while he could see the District met the criteria for delisting, it was very unfortunate.

G Roberson said that he agreed with C Brewer, and added that it was a stark lesson in that the City Ordinance, not the National Register, provided protection.

Motion by A Eddings to approve the petition to delist the debar Historic District from the NRHP; **Second** by C Brewer. All approve.

Item No. 6, being: (HD 17-16a) Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness request for the installation of a garage door and garage door trim for property located at 508 Chautauqua.

A Starr pointed out in the staff report that the garage doors had already been installed, but that the Commission was to address the application as if the project had not been completed. Debbie Greene was present to answer questions.

Public Comment:

Lee Hall, 648 S Lahoma, said that she commended that owner for the care and attention to detail on the project.

Commission Comments:

C Brewer said that the wooden carriage door that was proposed met the criteria as stated in 2.3.5 of the Historic Preservation Handbook. *“Make New Construction Compatible. If a new garage is the approved alternative, it shall be compatible in form, scale, size, materials, features, and finish with the principal structure. New accessory structures shall maintain the traditional height and proportion of accessory buildings in the district.”*

Motion by C Brewer to approve the application as submitted; **Second** by A Eddings. All approve.

Item No. 7, being: (HD17-25a) Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness request for installation of a garage door and garage door trim for property located at 540 S Lahoma.

A Starr gave the staff report; Curtis McCarty was present to answer questions.

Mr. McCarty stated that he was seeking a garage door that would rise with an opener, not a swing style door. He said that he also wanted a durable door that required less maintenance and was lighter in weight. He stated that the door the Guidelines stipulated would not withstand a 90 mile an hour wind, and thus would not pass the City’s Building Code.

Public Comment:

Lee Hall: 648 S Lahoma

She stated that it was her understanding that many of the steel doors installed in the Historic District were installed before the district was established. She asked if any steel doors had been approved by the Commission that faced the street. A Starr said that this was correct. She did add

that it was allowed to replace like-with-like. So a steel door could have been replaced since the district was established under this rule.

Ms. Hall was instructed at the time when they replaced their garage door that since it faced the street it would not be possible to consider a steel door. A. Starr said that this was correct.

Ms. Hall said while that Mr. McCarty had come up with a compromise that worked for him, but that compromise was not in character with the neighborhood.

Commission Discussion:

G Roberson: asked if, when the survey was done, was there documentation to show what percentage of the garage doors were wooden? A Starr stated this information was not available.

C Brewer: stated that there had been a lot of discussion at the March meeting, when the garage design was reviewed by the Commission, concerning the door type. He said that he appreciated the amount of research the applicant had done since the last meeting, but since the garage faced the street, the door needed to be wood.

He stated 2.3.5 of the Guidelines: *“Make New Construction Compatible. If a new garage is the approved alternative, it shall be compatible in form, scale, size, materials, features, and finish with the principal structure. New accessory structures shall maintain the traditional height and proportion of accessory buildings in the district.”* He stated that even though this was a new construction, the structure still needed to be compatible with the neighborhood.

R Kaplan: stated that he had not attended the March meeting, so was not there for the discussion. He stated that he did not feel that a stamped metal door is appropriate, but that opinion is largely because of how it looks. The struggle that he has is that the “appearance” of a wood door is provided with the proposed door. He felt that a durable material that can withstand the elements, is low maintenance and is strong yet still gives the appearance of a wood door may need to be considered. He said that the Halls’ garage is about 6- feet from street where the proposed garage door is much further back and the door could be perceived as wood from the street.

C Brewer: his concern is that for future cases, what would be the appropriate distance from the street be? How would this be addressed in future cases?

G Roberson: stated that the Commission was charged with the enforcement of the Guidelines and the Ordinance, not with how something looks. And these are based on the Secretary of Interior Standards. Under those, materials are a significant part of historic features. The distance from the street may look like a historic feature, but is not. That is what gives us pause. We are setting a precedent and he still thinks wood is what is appropriate.

E Gavaghan: stated she was not at the March meeting. She said that the Commission had discussed, and continues to discuss, appearance and materials. She felt that the appearance is satisfactory.

Chair John: said that much like the use of smart siding, which he is against, he said that while the proposed door mimics wood, it does not match the irregularities in natural wood properties. He could not support the proposed door, especially since it is facing the street.

A Eddings: stated she could look at it more favorably since it is a new structure. There is a wood component to the door.

A Starr: wanted to point out that the garage is 100-feet from the street and is a new structure. She said that the Commission could ask the applicant if he was open to an alternative.

C McCarty: knows that the Commission is considering making changes to the Guidelines and he hopes that they will look into more modern products. He said that he could get a cheap Masonite door but that's not what he wants to do. A wood door will not last. After the meeting last month he had spent a lot of time researching doors. He would ask that that the Commission vote on this tonight since it was his 4th time to come to the Commission.

A Starr: wanted to add that after the last meeting she checked with the homeowner at 648 S Lahoma. The door is a pressed wood with a wood frame.

Chair John: said that since it is a new structure perhaps more leeway could be given.

A Eddings: stated that when considering the capability of replacement materials, the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation says that deterioration can be replaced by materials that are compatible in visual qualities but not necessarily in material. Replacement of same is not always possible.

1.4.6 of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation *“Repair Rather Than Replace. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacements of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”*

R Kaplan: stated that because it is new construction, and the distance from the street, plus the design not just the material, and where it uses wood, would be reason for approval.

C Brewer: pointed out that the history of what has decided by the Commission is pretty straight forward. As long as there is a product available, the Commission does not need to accommodate a new material.

Motion by E Gavaghan to approve the application as submitted; **Second** by R Kaplan. The motion failed with a vote of 3 to 3, with Chair John, G Roberson and C Brewer voting against.

Item No. 8, being: Consideration and recommendation of an Ordinance to designate the expansion of the Southridge Neighborhood as a Historic District overlay for the property generally located between 1310 Classen and 1604 Classen as well as the Earl Sneed Park.

A Starr gave the staff report. Paul Johnston was present to answer questions.

C Brewer asked if there was a time when the Commission could review an application for the park. A Starr said only if it would pertain to a structure.

Letters of support were e-mailed to the Commission. No protest letters were received.

Chair John said that he was comfortable with making a positive recommendation of support to the City Council

Motion by G Roberson moved to accept the recommendation to approve the ordinance to designate the expansion of the Southridge Neighborhood as a Historic District overlay; Second by R Kaplan. All approve.

Item No. 9, being: Staff report on active Certificate of Appropriateness since February 12, 2018 and consideration of six month extension requests.

- 549 S Lahoma – The City is still in the appeal process.
- 506 S Lahoma – Work has not begun; Building permit will expire in May.
- 717 W Boyd – Carport has not begun.
- 428 Chautauqua – No activity; building permit has not been picked up.
- 516 Macy – Garage, accessory structure and shingles finished. Trim nearly complete.
- 518 Chautauqua – Garage complete.
- 710 S Lahoma – Building permit issued.
- 508 Macy – Sidewalks and driveway have been installed.
- 638 S Lahoma – Project has not begun.

There were no extension requests.

Item No. 10, being: Staff report on projects approved by Administrative Bypass since March 5, 2018.

There were none.

Item No. 11, being: Staff report on FY2017-18 CLG grant funded projects.

The Lydick's Addition survey – Final draft due by May 15th.
SHPO recommends the Commissioners attend CAMP on June 7th at the OK Historic Preservation Conference.

Item No. 12, being: Staff report on FY2018-2019 CLG grand funded projects.

Funds were not granted from City Council for the Guidelines projects.

Item No. 13, being: Announcements.

Forum 2018 has requested a Commission picture. This will be taken at 6:00, May 25th.

Item No. 14, being: Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Passed and approved this _____ day of _____ 2018.

David John, Chair