HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF

May 5, 2014

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met for the Regular Meeting on May 5, 2014, at 7:00 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 7:10 p.m.

Item No. 1, being: Roll Call.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Cameron Brewer Rangar Cline Anna Eddings David John Neil Robinson Scott Williams
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Russell Kaplan Loy Macari Chesley Potts
STAFF MEMBER PRESENT:	Susan Atkinson, Historic Preservation Officer Jolana McCart, Admin Tech IV
GUESTS:	Holly Hunt Kash Barker Stacy Pattillo

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

Motion by S Williams for approval; Second by A Eddings. All approve.

Item No. 3, being: Approval of Minutes from the April 7, 2014 Regular Meeting.

Motion by D John for approval; Second by R Cline. All approve.

Item No. 4, being: Staff report on projects approved by Administrative Bypass since April 7, 2014.

There were none granted this month.

Item No. 5, being: Staff report on CLG projects.

S Atkinson stated that 7 Commissioners will be attending the State Preservation Conference. Registration fees will be paid out of CLG grant funds. The City Council approved the FY14 CLG grant for the Southridge Neighborhood survey. The RFP should go out in July.

Item No. 6, being: Continuation of the Certificate of Appropriateness at 549 S Lahoma. (Denied 11-7-11) (Appeal overturned 1-12-12) (Easley)

The Bench Trial is scheduled for July 23, 24, and 25.

Item No. 7, being: Continuation of the Certificate of Appropriateness at 720 W Boyd (Granted 12-3-12) (Granted 12-2-13) (Granted 1-6-14). (The Logan Building)

The applicant is awaiting parking permits.

Item No. 8, being: Continuation of the Certificate of Appropriateness at 410 S Peters. (Granted 12-3-12; Ext 1-7--13) (COA reissued on 1-6-14) (Posey)

A contractor has been hired and work should begin May 26th.

Item No. 9, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 322 Alameda. (Denied 7-1-13 but the applicant will replace like with like. Has 30 months to complete project. Will monitor (Murphy)

The applicant has until 2016 to bring this property into compliance.

Item No. 10, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 321 Duffy. (Denied 8-5-13 but the applicant is now replacing like with like. Will monitor. (Cason)

This project is complete and will be removed from the agenda.

Item No. 11, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 517 S Lahoma. (Granted 8-5-13) (Alexander)

The project is continuing.

Item No. 12, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 640 Chautauqua. (Granted 9-9-13) (Granted 11-4-13) (Granted 1-6-14) (Mallett)

This project is complete and will be removed from the agenda.

Item No. 13, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 712 Miller. (Granted 11-4-13) (LeBeau)

Paving permits have been granted and construction should begin as soon as possible.

Item No. 14, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 428 Chautauqua. (1-6-14) (Hooper)

The owner is continuing to explore other options.

Item No. 15, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 727 Chautauqua. (1-6-14) (Srouji)

Project has not begun.

Item No. 16, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 607-609 S Lahoma. (2-3-14) (Swift)

This project is complete and will be removed from the agenda.

Item No. 17, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 321 Duffy. (2-3-14) (Cason)

This project has not begun.

Item No. 18, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 231 E Symmes. (4-5-13) (Extension 1-31-14) (Mary Abbot House).

The project is on hold due to funding issues.

Item No. 19, being: Continuation of a Certificate of Appropriateness for 621 Chautauqua. (White)

The old addition has been removed and the project is moving along quickly.

Item No. 20, being: Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 434 Chautauqua. (Barker)

This applicant is returning to the Commission with a new component to a continuing project. They are requesting to remove the dormer peaks on the front elevation; to continue the existing mansard roof with wood shingle siding on the second floor; and to change the front screened in porch to one with open railing and baluster system with piers with tapered cedar columns. This house, built around 1925 or 1929, is a contributing structure to the district.

Susan Atkinson gave the staff report. Holly Hunt, applicant architect, and the owner, Kash Barker, were present to answer questions.

After questions were answered from the Commission to the architect, Chair Robinson opened the floor for Commissioner comments.

S Williams stated that while the applicant and architect felt that the dormer peaks were not original, he disagreed. Having worked on a house on Lahoma, and knowing the techniques of

that time, he felt the house is original. He said that he had discovered in his own experiences that the craftsmanship quality of that time was what it was. He felt that the drawings submitted for the window design would create dark holes due to the presented set-back and would do a disservice to the house. He also said that unless evidence could be shown, the porch was also original. He stated that the submitted application design was not of craftsmen style. The porch is deeper on the south side than the north side. That could show some concern to the originality and that perhaps the porch was open at one time. But there is no definite proof.

Chair Robinson said that changing the fascia on the dormers does look as if the sheathing board never had anything on it. It would leave you to believe that it was added but it is not known when. It is possible that the porch could have been different at some point.

S Williams said that he felt that the way the house is now is original. He said that with his experience with a house on Lahoma, and knowing construction techniques of that time, the house is original. He did not see any indication on the sheathing boards that there was any finish over the top of it leaving him to believe that the mansards aspect was original. He felt the application would create dark holes and it would do disservice to the house. He did not feel that the proposed drawing was the way the house was originally. He said that the worksmanship quality that is allowing the critter issues today was very common for that time. He said that the proposed designs for the porch are not of a craftsman style. He felt that the porch is also original unless the applicant can supply proof otherwise. He stated that screens in the 1920's was common.

Chair Robinson said that the break lines – especially the lower one – could have been an extension from the deck of the original porch. He felt that there could have been some changes there.

S Williams said that sometimes there would be a wall then a break for water runoff. He said that the extension could be for water runoff. He said that it was common to have a ½ wall porch. He said that without some sign or footprint of a previous column, it was not possible to tell if one existed.

Motion by S Williams for denial of the application; Second by D John.

S Atkinson informed the Commission that they could table part of the application for more information.

S Williams withdrew his motion.

Motion by S Williams for denial of the application pertaining to the roof modifications but requested more information per the originality of the porch; Second by D John.

R Cline pointed out Item 4 of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, which states "*Acknowledge Changes Over Time. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.*" He said that even if the porch had been modified shortly after being constructed, and it's been like that for a long time and thus it would still be considered historic.

A Eddings stated that any modifications done before 1940 would be considered historic in its own right. She also cited The Secretary of Interior Standards.

S Atkinson stated that removing the screens would not remove any of the characteristics of the house. This could be a way of giving the porch a more open form.

A Eddings stated that the proposed design would be putting a craftsman style porch on a colonial style house.

S Atkinson also stated that the applicant would not need to come to the Commission to repair the roof. That would fall under normal maintenance and repair.

R Cline said, in support of the motion, the proposed design would be in danger of remuddeling things. He said that you are taking something historic and changing it into something it never was. For this reason he said the proposed design was flawed.

The motion **passed** with a **unanimous vote**.

Item No. 21, being: Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for 135 E Castro (Stacy Pattillo)

This application is to remove a door opening on non-original rear addition and to cover that opening with siding.

Motion by R Cline for approval as present; Second by C Brewer..

Item 22, being: Miscellaneous.

S Williams would be hosting the Ledbetter house tour for the State Preservation Conference.

Item No. 23, being: Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Passed and approved this 2nd day of June 2014.

Neil Robinson, Chair