

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF**

September 14, 2015

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met for the Regular Meeting on September 14, 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 6:35 p.m.

Item No. 1, being: Roll Call.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Cameron Brewer
Anna Eddings
Bill Hickman
David John
Russell Kaplan
Chesley Potts
Neil Robinson
Scott Williams

MEMBERS ABSENT: Loy Macari

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Anaïs Starr, Planner II
Jolana McCart, Admin Tech IV
Susan Connors, Planning & Community Development
Director
Jeanne Snider, Assistant City Attorney II

GUESTS: Lynda Ozan, Architectural Historian
Dave Boeck, Architect
See Attached list

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

Motion by S Williams for approval of the Agenda; **Second** by D John. All approve.

Item No. 3, being: Approval of Minutes from the July 6, 2015 Regular Meeting. (No meeting was held in August.)

Motion by A Eddings for approval of the minutes; **Second** by C Potts. All approve.

Item No. 4, being: Consideration of a National Register Nomination for the Amory Building located on the University of Oklahoma campus at 103 West Brooks Street.

Lynda Ozan, Architectural Historian for SHPO, gave the presentation.

Motion by B Hickman for approval of the Nomination to the National Register; **Second** by R Kaplan. All approve.

Item No. 5, being: (HD Case 15-13) Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a garage, additional concrete paving, an 8 foot rear yard fence, a 6 foot side yard fence and a covered patio for property located at 506 S Lahoma Avenue.

A Starr gave the staff report. Dave Boeck, architect for the applicant, was present to answer questions.

B Hickman asked Mr. Boeck if some of the staff recommendations would be amenable to his client? Mr. Boeck said that cutting the size of the patio and the garage could be amenable, but the presented application was what the applicant wanted.

Concerns expressed by the Commissioners to the applicant's architect included:

1. Tree in the path of the 8' back fence.
2. Size of the garage and patio.
3. Excessive backyard paving.
4. Height of the garage.
5. Patio extending past the back of the house.

Audience speakers:

Becky Patten – 512 S Lahoma (south of the proposal)

Ms. Patten has lived at this address since 1994 and feels that she understands the history of the neighborhood. The applicant is asking to build a 4 car garage, to replace a wood deck with concrete slab patio, to pave most of the back yard, and to build 6 and 8 foot fences. There would be no need for these changes if the current use of the property didn't exceed what is allowed in a single family residential R-1 zoned neighborhood. The drivers of four dozen cars have used the house in the last month and 2 dozen have stayed the night. The use has become more intense with the start of the fall semester. This requires a lot of space for parking, even with 5 cars on the existing concrete slab on the back and 3-4 cars in the driveways. This proposal is the epitome of the type of project not allowed under the City's historic handbook as revised in 2009. She said that if the proposal is allowed, no less than 70% of the back yard would be covered in concrete, with the main purpose being for parking. She said that the proposed garage structure would not only be visible from her yard but also from the street and houses across the street. The roof would be 6 feet above the proposed 8 foot fence. She was also concerned about a possible "gap" between fences that would need to be maintained.

Ted Krampf – 452 S Lahoma (north of the proposal)

Mr. Krampf stated that he feels that the residents have a virtual boarding house with an unknown number of bedrooms and occupants since no one has been allowed inside the house to determine how many live there, how many bedrooms they have or anything inside the house. He felt that building a garage is not compatible with the current Historic District regulations. The backyard will virtually be a concrete area which is against the rules. More parking will cause more traffic

and disturbance to the neighbors. The 4 car garage at 452 Chautauqua will hold 3 cars if all the tables, etc. are removed. It's really a 3 car garage and the most in it now is a truck and a car.

Dan Glenn – 800 W Imhoff

Mr. Glenn had previously lived at 506 S Lahoma for 12 years and the property has been in this configuration for 30 years. The intention was to put in a two car garage. He said that the neat thing about this neighborhood is that it is a university neighborhood that is not run over with rooming houses. The proposal that is being presented tends to drive it to being some kind of rooming house. It is a 3 bedroom house but has one large bedroom that could be subdivided. 2 other areas could also be used as bedrooms and the bedrooms are large and could be used for more than one person. He said that what you are looking at here is not as much an architectural proposal as much as a change in the neighborhood. He felt that the proposal should be rejected.

Melisa Michalski – 527 Chautauqua

Ms. Michalski has lived here since July and is also new to Norman. She loves the new neighborhood and her neighbors and was amazed at the meeting turnout. She toured the aforementioned house and stated that it is very big with other large rooms. She said that the elephant in the room was the nonconforming use of a single family home. She lives next door to a historic property that is being used this way. The back yard is mostly paved and there is between 4 and 8 cars parked in the back yard on and off every day of the week. The house is not well maintained and trash is left outside. She understands the architects point. This is the practical way to build a driveway in a new neighborhood but this is not a new neighborhood. She feels that she owns her house but she is also a steward of it and is to be caring for it and her neighbors and her community. If the applicant wants to build the biggest garage in Norman, she suggested that they buy a piece of land outside the historic district and do it. She said that the Guidelines are a proxy for stewardship, community, and for caring about saving just a little of this from being a rooming house or transient of people not caring about the neighborhood. She would urge the Commission to think about what the regulations are a proxy for. There are reasons for rules because they mean something with a purpose is behind them. You can get around them, but think about why they are there. She does not see how these changes are in keeping in line with the true purposes of having this district.

David Dollarhide – 645 S Lahoma

David and his wife Vicki have lived in the district for 29 years and were involved in the establishment of the Chautauqua Historic District. He said that they value the designation and the well-designed Guidelines that protect it. They have respect and appreciation for the years of work that the neighbors, City Council and City staff have put into preserving the historical and residential integrity of the neighborhood and take great pride in this community collaboration. He stated that those that have purchased property in an established historic area must be aware of this important covenant agreed upon by its residents. A disregard for the rules they all follow to insure the preservation of our neighborhood endangers the district and impacts them all. He said that as residents they oppose projects that do not adhere to its guidelines. He said that he was here to oppose the application at 506 S Lahoma. Specifically the section pertaining to the additional paved parking in the back yard. He reminded the Commission that they heard a similar request 10 years on October 3, 2005. This application was for additional paving in the front, back, a carport and demo of an existing garage. A precedent setting decision was made by the Commission which applies to this application. At that time, opposition addressed noise and

light pollution, back yard intrusions, and additional traffic coming and going at all hours. The parking limitations are accepted in this neighborhood. It should be noted that the property can already accommodate more cars than the normal. More paving and parking will only allow for more cars and increased disturbance. One former City Councilmember reminded the Commission that preservation of the neighborhood was a commitment by the City of Norman to all members of the district and one of the principals upon which the District was established. The Commissioners had expressed concerns about parking at that time, but said that the guidelines stated preserving the integrity and continuity of the district. Another stated that the owner purchased property that did not serve the buyer's needs. Another said that it put too much stress on the lot. Another said that there are concessions to living in a historic district and paving a large area in the back yard was not a solution. He just wanted to say that if these requests are allowed, the protection that they had all worked so hard for will become meaningless and no one will feel safe that the nature of the neighborhood will remain and many will fear that back yard parking lots will replace landscaping. The neighborhood will become noise and pollution and cars and traffic and homes converted to boarding houses.

Karen Thurston – 712 Cruce

Ms. Thurston said that historic districts protect neighborhoods. She said that they are stewards of their property. She compared the neighborhood to a piece of art. She said that museums are open to the public so they can see the beauty of the works. With 6 and 8 foot fences around it, the public cannot view the art. She said that the architecture should not be covered up with concrete block or even a pretty 8 foot fence. Rules and regulations were established to preserve history not to annoy or to make new people disgusted with us, but preserving history. She stated that when someone moves into a historic area you need to keep that in mind.

Commissioner discussion began.

The proposal was broken into 5 segments for ease of discussion:

1. A four car garage;
2. Additional concrete paving for parking;
3. 8 foot rear yard fence;
4. 6 foot side yard fence and
5. A covered patio.

1) Four Car Garage:

Sections of the Historic District Guidelines pointed out by the Commission during item discussion:

- Page 23, Section 2.1, Site and Landscape, Site Rhythms
- Page 69, Section 4.2.3 Guidelines for Additions to Historic Buildings, Limit Size and Scale
- Page 26, Section 2.3.5 Guidelines for Garages & Accessory Structures, Make New Construction Compatible
- Page 26, Section 2.3.4 Guidelines for Garages & Accessory Structures, Request for Garage Demolitions (*Will footprint be 500 square feet or less?*)

C Brewer stated that the garage proposal was too big and that a 2 car garage would be more appropriate. There was no precedent for a 4 car garage since the adoption of the current guidelines. He had concerns of the orientation of the structure. He was not comfortable discussing modifications to the application as part of the motion. They would be too significant. The actual design and pitch of the roof are fine.

R Kaplan said that he could not find a significant direction but did see Section 4.2.3 which limits the size and scale of additions. The footprint should not exceed 50% of the existing structure. He felt that the height and the pitch were ok.

D John mentioned Section 2.3.5. He said that looking at the district as a whole, it would restrict the size of a structure that could be built. He felt that a 4 car garage was too large.

Chair Robinson said that the idea when the Guidelines were drafted was to not only provide direction for those attempting to meet them, but to also to allow the Commission to apply these in a way that would be reasonable. He said that terms such as “shall maintain the tradition and proportion of accessory buildings” so what is proportionate to one is not to another. He said that the Guidelines couldn’t give the District square footage as the only way to go. He said that what the Commission was looking at is a structure that is out of proportion to the neighborhood and the site itself.

B Hickman mentioned a tree that would be in the stall of the garage and that he is not a fan of removing trees. A 4 car garage is overwhelming for the Guidelines. He appreciated the attempt to hide the structure from the street. A 2 car garage tied into the existing paving would make logical sense.

C Brewer pointed out Section 2.3.4, which says no larger than 500 square feet. That points to a 2 car garage.

C Potts said that she felt that the garage could have been placed to one side or the other of the house.

C Brewer stated that he had a concern about the orientation of the garage and felt that it could be placed in the NW corner using the current paving as a back out.

Motion by D John to deny the COA as submitted for a four car garage with the finding of fact that the proposal is not consistent with the Historic Preservation Guidelines for garages and accessory structures. **Second** by S Williams. All approve.

2) Additional concrete paving for parking:

C Brewer said that this was directly tied to the placement of the garage. Since the garage was denied, you could not approve the paving.

R Kaplan said if there was a new proposal for a smaller garage in the NW corner, that he would feel more comfortable approving that, if the current paving were removed providing new paving

which would be ample for the garage with a backup space but no more than what is necessary. No additional space would be allowed for additional outdoor parking.

Motion by S Williams to deny the COA as submitted for additional backyard paving at 506 S Lahoma. **Second** by R Brewer. All approve.

3) 8 Foot Rear Yard Fence:

The back fence would include the back property line running N/S and the south elevation to the back of the house.

While Ms. Patten had requested that the new fencing tie into the existing fencing to stop a gap being formed, the Commission could only state that the fence abuts the property line.

C Brewer said that applications were to be viewed on a case by case basis and can't see the justification for an 8 foot fence. A 6 foot fence would provide privacy as outlined in the Guidelines. If it's not mutually agreed upon, an 8 foot fence should not be built.

Motion by B Hickman to approve the COA for an 8 foot back yard fence at 506 S Lahoma, with the condition that it abuts the property line and the Commission strongly recommends that the existing tree is not removed. Tree removal can only be done upon ownership determination. This approval does not include permission to remove the tree. **Second** by R Kaplan. The motion passed with a vote of 6 to 2, with C Brewer and Chair Robinson voting against.

4) 6 Foot Side Yard Fence:

The side yard fence would be on the south elevation of the property, from the rear of the house to the front of the house.

Motion by S Williams to approve a 4 foot side yard fence on both the north and south side of the house, and the fence on the south side that abuts the rear side of the house may be 6 feet high; **Second** by D John. The motion passed with a vote of 7 to 1, with B Hickman voting against.

5) Covered patio:

B Hickman said that he could not approve a concrete patio, since that could be used as a parking pad. He felt that the proposal was too large and should not extend past the side of the house.

A Eddings agreed. She felt the patio extended too far beyond the south side of the house and does not comply with the Guidelines.

C Brewer asked if the patio design would change due to the denial of the garage.

D Boeck said that the idea was to keep the patio connected to the house.

Motion by B Hickman to deny the application for the patio as presented as it is inconsistent to the Guideline's; **Second** by S Williams. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Item No. 6, being: Staff report on active Certificate of Appropriateness since July 6, 2015 and consideration of six month extension requests.

Updates on approved active Certificates of Appropriateness:

- **549 S Lahoma** – Litigation regarding the denial of removal of windows is pending in District Court. Plaintiff and city attorney are to file a request for clarification on judge's previous ruling.
- **410 Peters** – Work on-going. Front porch stairs are being installed.
- **322 Alameda** – Owner has ordered the windows.
- **434 Chautauqua** – Column installation is complete.
- **415 S Lahoma** – Windows, door and alterations to the front porch as complete.
- **415 ½ Lahoma** – Interior work is being done. Demo is to start soon.
- **428 Chautauqua** – The house has been moved to allow for the removal of the basement and installation of new footing at the final location.
- **432 Chautauqua** – Building permit is ready to be picked up. Awaiting the final location of 428 Chautauqua.
- **642 S Lahoma** – No report given.

There were no extensions requested.

Item No. 7, being: Staff report on projects approved by Administrative Bypass since July 6, 2015.

620 Miller – 6 foot rear fence and a 4 foot side yard fence.

Item No. 8, being: Staff Report on Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant.

Staff is working with the Southridge neighborhood in regards to a future request for a district designation.

The RFP for the Wetzler survey was sent out on September 3, 2015.

The fall seminar has been tentatively set for November 13th and 14th.

Item No. 9, being: Announcements

There were no announcements.

Item No. 10, being: Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Passed and approved this 6th day of October 2015.



Chair Neil Robinson

Historic District Commission

9/14/2015

1 Shannon Corhill

2 TOUREN

3 Lynette Lobban

4 STAN BERRY

5 Anita [unclear]

6 Melissa Mortazavi

~~7 [unclear]~~

8 Susan Westlund

9 Richard Y. [unclear]

10 Rosemary Knapp

11 John Greer

12 Marjorie Greer

13 Kim Zahler

14 Susan Magg

15 Mark Yeary

16 Kevin Pipes 733 Lakeside

17 Jeanette Doty

18

19

Historic District Commission

9/14/2015

1 Lynda Ozan

2 DAVE BOECK

3 Janelle Powers

4 Bill Powers

5 Jimmy Sadner

6 Ann Boyd

7 NANCY CURRY

8 Hawkins Adams

9 Ann Jones

10 Lynn Pettyjohn

11 Ted Crump, Jr

12 George Wm Pettyjohn

13 Nolan Kelly

14 Rick Hall

15 Lee Hall

16 Elaine Boyd

17 MARVIN YORK

18 Becky Patten

19 Sara McFall

Historic District Commission

9/14/2015

1 Karen Thurston

2 Lynne Miller

3 Mike Montgomery

4 Jayne Crumpley

5 Ben Holt

6 Jura Baggett

7 Brent Baggett

8 Wade Caldwell

9 Jonnie Hunt

10 Jane Carson

11 David Dollarhide

12 Vicki Dollarhide

13 Cheryl K Berry

14 Cathie Hicks

15 Mark Wells

16

17

18

19