

November 5, 2015

David Boeck  
On behalf of Blue Lahoma, LLC  
922 Schulze Drive  
Norman, Oklahoma 73071

Via email

RE: Historic District Commission Decision on Certificate of Appropriateness at  
506 S. Lahoma Avenue (COA 15-17)

Dear Mr. Boeck:

This letter formally summarizes the Historic District Commission's decision made on Monday, November 2, 2015, regarding your request for Certificate of Appropriateness at 506 S. Lahoma Avenue for the installation of a garage, additional paving and a covered patio (COA HD 15-17). Initially this request was heard at the October 5, 2015 meeting and was continued to a future meeting to allow for verification of tree placement and patio on the drawings, for consideration of a re-design of Option 2 garage location, and for a reduction in the garage size. At the October 5, 2015 meeting, several Commissioners suggested an alternate location for the Option 2 design that did not require the removal of the existing trees on the north property line. The continued COA HD 15-17 was heard at the November 2, 2015 Historic District Commission meeting with the following requested alterations to the property:

**Option 1** (preferred option of the owner)

- 1) Installation of a two-car garage on the south side of the existing parking pad
- 2) Installation of an 18' x 25' covered patio adjacent to the rear of the house

As suggested by the Commission, you submitted Option 2 that had an alternate location for the garage located closer to the north property line and did not require the removal of the trees. However, this placement required the removal of the existing pad, and, therefore, this design was the less acceptable option for the owner. The preferred design by the owner was Option 1. Option 2 had the following requested alterations to the property:

**Option 2**

- 1) Installation of a two-car garage on the west side of the existing parking pad;
- 2) Removal of existing parking pad; the installation of new pavement to access the proposed garage; a turnaround area; and
- 3) Installation of an 18' x 25' covered patio adjacent to the rear of the house.

## Commission Decision

For review, the Commission split your clients' request into three parts.

### 1) Proposed garage installation

A motion was made to approve the garage and garage placement as shown in Option 2. The vote was 4 to 4, resulting in a denial for the requested installation of a garage.

### 2) Proposed additional pavement installation

The Commission stated that since the garage request was not approved, a decision on pavement to a non-existent garage was not needed.

### 3) Proposed covered patio installation

The Commission voted unanimously to approve the installation of the covered patio as submitted.

## Discussion

The Historic District Commission reviewed the request for the installation of a garage in Option 1, but a majority of Commissioners found the garage location did not meet the Guidelines for location. Commissioners considered the following in their determination that Option 1 garage location was not compatible with the Guidelines:

- 1) Did not meet the following section of the ***Historic Preservation Handbook***:

#### ***2.4 Guidelines for Sidewalks, Driveways, and Off-Street Parking***

***.1 Driveway Location.*** *In historic districts, residential driveways shall be perpendicular to the street, except in individual cases where there is historical documentation of an alternate configuration.*

*Unless there is historic documentation otherwise, driveways shall be located near the property line on one side of the house;*

- 2) The orientation of the driveway and garage should be perpendicular to the street as is found historically in the neighborhood; and
- 3) The garage should meet the historic rhythm of the street in regards to driveway and garages alignment, which is a driveway along one side of the property, leading to the garage.

The Commission reviewed Option 2 after the owner indicated their willingness to consider this Option for installation. The Commission found that the location of the garage was compatible with the above cited guidelines. However, several Commissioners found the size

of the garage of 572 square feet to be too large to be compatible with the Historic Preservation Guidelines. Commissioners cited the following:

- 1) Did not meet the following sections of the *Historic Preservation Handbook*:

**2.3 Guidelines for Garages & Accessory Structures**

*.4 Request for Garage Demolitions. The HDC will consider the following criteria when a garage structure demolition and/or replacement is proposed:*

*Will new footprint be 500 square feet or less?*

*.5 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.*


- 2) Based upon Guideline 2.3.5, the garage width should be reduced to be more proportional to the house in order not to be overwhelming in size or mass to the main structure.

**Appeals Process**

You have the right to appeal this decision to the Norman City Council. **The deadline to appeal is 5 PM November 12, 2015.** If you choose to exercise this option, please prepare a letter stating your intent to appeal the decision of the Historic District Commission to Norman City Clerk Brenda Hall. You may email this letter to the Clerk at [brenda.hall@normanok.gov](mailto:brenda.hall@normanok.gov) or send it by mail to 201 West Gray, Norman 73069. Her telephone number is 366-5405.

Please let me know if we need to discuss this matter in more detail as you evaluate your options.

Sincerely,



Anaïs Starr, AICP  
Historic Preservation Officer