

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF**

February 2, 2015

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met for the Regular Meeting on February 2, 2015, 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 Neil Robinson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Item No. 1, being: Roll Call.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Cameron Brewer
Anna Eddings
David John
Russell Kaplan
Neil Robinson
Scott Williams

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bill Hickman
Loy Macari
Chesley Potts

STAFF MEMBER PRESENT: Anaïs Starr, Planner II
Jolana McCart, Admin Tech IV

GUESTS: Quentin Bomgardner
James Harp
Mark Krittenbrink
Jody Foote
Joe Foote
Rick Poland
Hollie Hunt

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

Motion by S Williams for approval of the Agenda; **Second** by A Eddings. All approve.

Item No. 3, being: Approval of Minutes from the January 5, 2015 Regular Meeting.

Motion by C Brewer for approval; **Second** by D John. All approve.

Item No. 4, being: (HD 15-02) Consideration of a request for Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new primary structure on Lot 8 Block 1 of Ross's Addition for the property located at 432 Chautauqua.

This application had been presented to the Commission at the January meeting for their input and review. It is now being brought to the Commission as a COA request.

A Starr gave the staff report; Mark Krittenbrink, architect and owner, and Hollie Hunt, project manager, were present to answer questions. The applicant requested to withdraw the driveway project from the application.

Rick Poland, 425 Chautauqua was present to discuss the driveway aspect of the application. He stated he had lived at this address since 1992. He said that if you look at the existing larger houses in the surrounding neighborhood, the driveways go beside the house into rear parking. He did not feel that having parking in front of the house was appropriate.

Motion by R Kaplan to discuss the driveway application separately from the house application. **Second** S Williams. All approve.

New construction discussion:

R Kaplan stated that he was pleased with the changes that had been made to the design since the January meeting.

S Williams stated that he felt the proportions were still off and that the structure was too massive. He felt that the window proportions were still not appropriate and that smaller windows were more indicative of the neighborhood. He said that with other masonry houses the windows are much smaller because of the load capacity of the masonry walls. The front entrance needed more detail and the door is too narrow for the surrounding details. He said that he could not approve the current design.

C Brewer stated that he did not want to compare the original design with the one presented. He said that he did not have an eye for proportion but based on the improvements made, he could approve it.

Chair Robinson stated that the Commission was not in the position to redesign the application for the applicant. He said that older homes and their materials were certainly different than modern materials and so the design would need to reflect those differences. It is also necessary for the design, according to the Secretary of Interior Standards, not to copy too closely or make too historic, yet remain compatible to the neighborhood. He said that he felt this design met that criteria and he could support it.

D John felt that the proportions of the windows were a little big on the bottom and would cause discord to the front of the house and that the proportions overall were off. He felt that the house would still appear to be massive from the street.

A Eddings felt that the earlier suggestions had been taken into consideration and there could be an argument made that it would fit in. But she did acknowledge that there was room for disagreement for what is acceptable.

Motion by R Kaplan to approve the application as submitted. **Second** D John. The motion passed with a vote of 5 to one, with S Williams voting against.

Driveway discussion:

A Starr pointed out to the Commission, and the applicant, that the driveway application would need to meet both the HDC Guidelines (HDC approval) as well as the Zoning Ordinance (Board of Adjustment variance) regarding the core area. One approval would not trump the other.

Motion by C Brewer to table the driveway application. **Second** R Kaplan. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Item No. 5, being: (HD 15-03) Request for a review and feedback of a proposed two story addition onto rear of the structure to be located at 428 Chautauqua described as Lot 7 Block 1 of Ross's Addition.

The owner is requesting to add an addition to the rear of a proposed relocated house and, at this time, is asking the Commission for input to his design. No action will be taken on this item.

A Starr gave the staff report. Mark Krittenbrink, architect and owner, and Hollie Hunt, project manager, were present to answer questions.

D John pointed out Guidelines Section 4.2.3 *“Exterior dimensions of the addition shall not exceed the exterior dimensions of the existing structure, including height, width, and depth.”*

Chair Robinson quoted the same section, but further stated *“An addition which does not increase the footprint of the existing structure may be allowed to increase roof height and will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.”*

Hollie Hunt stated that the second story addition would not be seen from the street.

S Williams said that the proposal looked good. He said that the addition looks like an addition. He felt that putting the bedroom over the dining area would not be possible while lowering the roof height. He liked both of the proposals.

C Brewer said that he liked the idea of the one story addition. He felt that the 2 story addition would be seen from the street.

R Kaplan stated that he was fine with either.

Mark Krittenbrink said that he could marry the two. The 2nd story as the original design is less in your face because it is less close to the street and back. And the original structure would not have to be torn into and the original material disturbed. It would just be adding on to the back of it. He asked if the Commission would be comfortable if he returned with a second floor addition design.

D John said that he wanted to make sure that the Commission stayed within the intent of the Guidelines. He was more comfortable with the 2nd proposal without the 2nd floor.

A Eddings said she could reconcile the proposals with the Guidelines, quoting "*if the addition did not increase the footprint of the existing structure may be allowed to increase roof height*". She said she would be more comfortable keeping the second story addition within the existing footprint. She aired concerns about seeing the second story from the street. She said that she had concerns about the wording of the Guidelines not being clear.

Item No. 6, being: (HD 15-04) Consideration of a request for Certificate of Appropriateness to replace two sets of windows on the rear of the structure located at 717 West Boyd Street described as part of Lots 14, 15, 16, Block 2 of Ross's Addition.

A Starr gave the staff report. Quentin Bomgardner, owner, was present to answer questions.

Motion by S Williams to approve the application as submitted. **Second** D John. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Item No. 7, being: (HD 15-05) Consideration of a request for Certificate of Appropriateness for following: Replacement of all windows and doors on the primary structure, alterations to the front porch on the primary structure, removal of a non-original addition to the secondary structure, alterations to the exterior on the secondary structure, and the installation of an exterior door on secondary structure for the property located at 415 and 415 ½ S Lahoma described as Lot 20, Block 1 of Ross's Addition.

A Staff gave the staff report. James Harp, owner, was present to answer questions.

Chair Robinson said that he was amazed that the structure that is proposed for demo was occupied at all. He said that he didn't see anything in the application that would cause problems with the Guidelines.

A Eddings said that since it is a non-contributing structure and did not have wood windows originally, the Guidelines requiring wood windows would not apply.

S Williams said that it was important not to try and historicize this structure. He advised against using plaster. Like- for- like windows would be nearly impossible to find. He did not feel that the chosen windows were appropriate and did not approve of the front door type. He said that the style is more modern and trying to retro the house would not do it justice.

C Brewer said that he echoed the concern about the chosen front door.

A Eddings said that a 9 or 15 light door would be more fitting.

Motion by C Brewer to approve the application as submitted except to use a 9 or 15 light door with staff review. **Second** A Eddings. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Item No. 8, being: Staff report on active COA's since January 5, 2015 and consideration of six month extension requests.

- 549 S Lahoma – Trial dates are still set for February.
- 410 Peters – Front porch and footings are nearly ready to pour. Will then be ready to lower the house back onto the footing.
- 322 Alameda – Owner plans to begin the window replacement late summer/fall of this year to bring the windows into compliance.
- 727 Chautauqua – Hoping to begin over spring break.
- 621 Chautauqua – Grasscrete parking has not begun.
- 434 Chautauqua – Nearing completion.
- 635 S Lahoma – Work has not begun.
- 408 Chautauqua – Work has not begun on the basement access.
- 645 S Lahoma – Work has not begun.
- 648 S Lahoma – Owner hoping to move in by February.

No requests for 6 month extensions.

Item No. 9, being: Report on projects approved by Administrative Bypass since January 5, 2015.

A Bypass COA was given for a new driveway at 912 Miller.

Item No. 10, Staff reports on CLG Projects.

The consultant has taken the pictures and is scanning the photos. It is time for consideration of a new grant application request.

Item No. 11, being: Miscellaneous Comments.

There were none

Item No. 12, being: Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Passed and approved this 3rd day of March 2015.


Neil Robinson, Chair