HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF

June 2, 2014

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met for the Regular Meeting on June 2, 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 7:05 p.m.

Item No. 1, being: Roll Call.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Cameron Brewer Rangar Cline Anna Eddings David John Loy Macari Chesley Potts Neil Robinson Scott Williams
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Russell Kaplan
STAFF MEMBER PRESENT:	Linda Price, Revitalization Manager Jolana McCart, Admin Tech IV
GUESTS:	Holly Hunt Mark Krittenbrink

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 May 5, 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 May 5, 2014.

There were none granted this month, but a fence Bypass had been issued for 720 Miller that was not reported last month.

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

L Price reminded the Commissioners of the State Preservation Conference. The Southridge Neighborhood survey 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)

Concrete has been poured for the parking area.

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)

Work should begin June 9th.

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 517 S Lahoma. (Granted 8-5-13) (Alexander)

The project is continuing.

Item No. 11, 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. 12, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 428 Chautauqua. (1-6-14) (Hooper)

The owner is continuing to explore other options.

Item No. 13, being: Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 727 Chautauqua. (1-6-14) (Srouji)

Project has not begun. The COA 6 month time is up this month.

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

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

Item No. 15, 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. 16, being: Continuation of a Certificate of Appropriateness for 621 Chautauqua. (White)

This project is continuing.

***Chesley Potts recused herself from this item due to a conflict of interest.**

Item No. 17, being: Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 434 Chautauqua. (Barker)

The applicant is returning to the Commission with a new component to an existing application and is requesting to change the front screened-in porch to one with open railing and baluster system with piers with tapered cedar columns. The Commission had tabled this application for want of more information as to the originality of the porch.

Linda Price gave the staff report. Mark Krittenbrink and Holly Hunt, architects for the applicant, were present to answer questions.

Some of the points that Mr. Krittenbrink presented for originality were:

- The porch boards coming through underneath the half wall. If the current porch design was original, the porch boards would have run continuously.
- South elevation. The siding does not match up, making it look like an infill.
- Window. The window looking onto the porch is not the style of window that would have been used if just opening onto a screened in porch.
- Support board. Possibly added later for support.
- Porch footprint. Concrete block and 2x4 frame out of plywood possibly used to replace a lattice panel.

Loy Macari felt that there had been enough evidence given to show that perhaps the porch was an addition. She also felt there was value in a structure that evolves through time. She did not feel that one outweighs the other. She said she had mixed feelings.

S Williams felt that there was an argument for both sides. He also brought up the evolution over time concern. But he wished to have the south elevation remain the same. He also stated that the

siding under the screened porch was the same as the rest of the house so he did not feel it was an argument for infill. He felt that new infill would show a siding break at the corner.

R Cline agreed.

Chair Robinson said he was satisfied with detailed analysis presented by the architect.

R Cline said that there is some indication that the porch was added on but it is still not known at what time. He was hesitant to approve it.

A Eddings said that since there was some evidence that the front wall was not original it would be hard to justify not letting the applicant change it. The change could have been made after 1940, which is out of the period of significance.

Motion by S Williams for approval of the application as designed with the following stipulations:

- South wall remains as is;
- Screens can be removed;
- Front infill can be changed with 3 possibilities: block to match the block already used in the house, lattice work, or siding;
- Balustrades would stop short of the porch floor.

Second by R Cline. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

***Chesley Potts returned to the meeting.**

Item No. 18, being: Continuation of a Certificate of Appropriateness for 135 E Castro (Stacy Pattillo)

No change.

Item 19, being: Miscellaneous.

There were no miscellaneous items to report.

Item No. 20, being: Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Passed and approved this 7th day of July 2014.

Neil Robinson, Chair