

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF**

**August 5, 2013**

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met for the Regular Meeting on August 5, 2013, at 7:00 p.m. Notice and Agenda of the meeting were posted at 201 West Gray Building A and the Norman Municipal Building twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Co-Chairperson Anais Starr called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Item No. 1, being: **Roll Call.**

MEMBERS PRESENT:                   Rangar Cline  
  Anna Eddings  
  David John  
  Russell Kaplan  
  Loy Macari  
  Chesley Potts  
  Anais Starr  
  Scott Williams

MEMBERS ABSENT:                   Neil Robinson

STAFF MEMBER PRESENT:           Susan Atkinson, Historic Preservation Officer  
  Jolana McCart, Admin Tech IV

GUESTS:                               Jeff Murphy  
  Li Yang  
  Len Cason  
  Trent Cason  
  Vera Courtney  
  Glen Alexander

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

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

Item No. 3, being: **Approval of Minutes from the July 1, 2013 Regular Meeting.**

**Motion** by D John for approval; Second by A Eddings. All approve.

Item No. 4, being: **Staff report on projects approved by Administrative Bypass since July 1, 2013.**

There had been none.

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

S Atkinson reported that the Infill Development Workshop will be held on September 12 in the City Council Chambers from 8:30 to 4:00. The Bob Yapp workshop will be held on October 8, 9 and 10<sup>th</sup>.

Item No. 6, being: **Continuation of the Certificate of Appropriateness at 549 S Lahoma. (Denied 11-7-11)**

S Atkinson stated that the dispositive motions deadline has been set for October 31. If the judge does not grant one of the motions, a Pretrial Conference date has been set for January 13, 2014 to set a trial date.

Item No. 7, being: **Continuation of the Certificate of Appropriateness at 639 S Lahoma. (Granted 12-5-11; 1-9-12; 10-08-12; 12-03-12)**

S Atkinson will speak to the owners of the property to see if they wish to pursue the remaining open COA projects. This project will probably be deemed complete and removed from the Agenda.

Item No. 8, being: **Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness (granted 05-07-12; 1-7-13) for 319 Castro.**

An error was made on the Agenda. This project was not presenting a new component for Commission action.

The house received an occupancy permit. The apartment project is continuing.

Item No. 9, being: **Continuation of the Certificate of Appropriateness at 435 Chautauqua Avenue. (Granted 10-8-12; Ext 04-13 and 10-13)**

Interior work is continuing.

Item No. 10, being: **Continuation of the Certificate of Appropriateness at 720 W Boyd. (Granted 12-3-12)**

The applicant received a parking variance and 3 out of the 10 units are pre-leased.

Item No. 11, being: **Continuation of the Certificate of Appropriateness at 410 S Peters. (Granted 12-3-12; Ext 1--13)**

The applicant has received an engineering report and they are seeking a contractor.

Item No. 12, being: **Continuation of the Certificate of Appropriateness at 231 E Symmes. (Granted 5-5-13) (Mary Abbot House)**

Nothing to report.

Item No. 13, being: **Continuation of Certificate of Appropriateness for 322 Alameda.**

*Note: The applicant is returning to the Commission to allow the Commission to include a specific finding regarding the timeframe in which the applicant must comply with the COA as approved.*

S Atkinson explained that the Commission was not re-hearing the original application, but was to address the issue of the compliance timeline; Jeff Murphy and Li Yang were present to answer questions.

Staff suggested a 3 year/5 windows per year timeframe to bring the windows into compliance. Mr. Murphy requested a 6 year timeframe, with replacement taking place all at the same time.

**Motion** by R Kaplin for a compliance timeline of 6 years, with the front façade to be completed within the first year; Second by S Williams.

After further discussion, R Kaplan resended his motion.

**Motion** by D John for a compliance timeline of 3 years, with the west elevation to be completed within the first year; Second by C Potts. All Approve.

Item No. 14, being: **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 321 Duffy.**

S Atkinson gave the staff report; Len Cason and Trent Cason were present to answer questions.

Staff reported that the application was to retain vinyl replacement windows that were installed without receiving a COA. 14 windows have been replaced at this time. She reminded the Commission that they were to review the application as if the work had not already been carried out.

Len Cason stated that he was not aware, nor made aware, of the house being in a historic district. He said that the windows were in poor condition and that he had spent \$8,600 on the current window replacement project. He had spoken with a contractor who stated it would cost \$1,200 per window to reinstall wood windows. His hope was that he would be able to work with the Commission to comply with the spirit of the ordinance but replacing the windows again would be a major financial undertaking.

To a question from a Commissioner concerning the front door, Mr. Cason stated that the door was original.

Chair Starr opened the floor for Commission discussion.

L Macari stated that she knew the applicant and wondered if she should recuse herself from this item.

S Atkinson asked Commissioner Macari if she had any financial interest with dealings with the applicant or if she felt her decision would be compromised by the decision? She said no. Staff said that there was not reason enough to recuse her from the current item.

S Williams stated that he did not feel there was any leeway on making a decision about this application since the Guidelines were very clear.

D John stated that this type of window/installation did not work well with stucco.

A Eddings echoed Commissioner Williams in saying that the Guidelines were very clean on replacing like with like in this instance.

C Potts asked if a replacement timeline could be set. S Atkinson said that a precedent has not been set by the previous decision but that they could also attach a timeline.

**Motion** by S Williams for rejection of the application as presented; Second by D John. All approve.

Item No. 15, being: **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 517 S Lahoma.**

Staff report was given by S Atkinson; Glen Alexander and Stan Berry, architect, were present to answer questions.

**Motion** by D John for approval as presented; Second by S Williams. All approve.

Item No. 16, being; Miscellaneous.

There were no miscellaneous items.

Item No. 17, being: **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Passed and approved this 9th day of September 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Anais Starr, Co-Chair