



\*

**Item No. 2, being: Approval of the minutes from the February 7, 2022 Meeting.**

**Motion** by Barrett Williamson for approval of the minutes from the February 7, 2022 regular meeting;

**Second** by Brent Swift.

*The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 8-0. Minutes from the previous meeting were approved and signed by Chair Emily Wilkins. (Shavonne Evans was not present for this vote.)*

\*

**Item No. 3, being: HD (22-08) Consideration of approval, rejection, amendment and/or postponement of a Certificate of Appropriateness request for replacement of asbestos roof tiles with an alternative roof material for the property located at 800 Miller Avenue.**

**Motion** by Mitch Baroff to approve Item No. 3 as submitted;

**Second** by Aaron Brooks.

Anais Starr presented the staff report:

This is a circa 1925 Tudor revival contributing structure to the Miller Historic District. It is indicated both on the 1925 and 1944 Sanborn insurance maps in its current configuration and footprint. Ms. Barnett, like many property owners in the Historic Districts, suffered extensive damage from the hail storm that occurred October 10, 2021. The roof is an asbestos-based transite tile, which is not a replaceable material. The contractor, Pinnacle Group, after consultation with staff, has identified two replaceable options for the roof. The first proposal is for an asphalt/composite shingle that has a tiled appearance, samples are provided to show the Commission. The second option is a DaVinci rubberized tile, which is similar to the size and look of the current tile on the roof. Staff consulted with the State Preservation Office architect to discuss this roof, because it is not something I have seen before. After discussion, we determined that the roof tile sample removed from the house is probably the original roof material to the house, and therefore it needs Commission's review to replace it with something else, because obviously it cannot be replaced with asbestos tile. The owner's preferred choice is the composite shingle. It should be noted that this is hail damage so they are limited by the funds provided by the insurance company. The second choice is the rubber tile, which comes closer to meeting the original tile shape and size. The State Historic Preservation Office recommended this rubber tile for consideration, but the preference of the owner is the composite material. The Commission will need to determine which

proposed roof material, or if both, would be appropriate for this structure. Staff is happy to answer any questions the Commission has.

Shayne Glickoff, property manager of Pinnacle Group, discussed the project:

The applicant represents the owner, Ashley Barnett. Samples are provided to the Commission for both options for roof replacement. DaVinci roofing tile is more plastic; it is a high-quality and the size is about the size of the tiles currently on the roof. Composite asphalt shingles are also provided; these have a "slate look." The quote for DaVinci tiles is \$58,399, compared with a price of around \$43,000 for the slate-look tiles. Ashley, the owner, will not have sufficient funding for the DaVinci tiles. Shayne mentions that a large number of houses in the surrounding area appear to have composite roofs. There will be another \$7,000 fee just to remove the asbestos tiles, which is a considerable amount impacting the replacement choices available.

Commission comments consisted of:

- Commissioner Barrett Williamson inquires about the material costs for the options available. Discusses potential alternatives, including common architectural shingles.
- Barrett also asks for clarification regarding the structure of the roof, whether there will be re-decking involved. Shayne confirms the plan is to replace all the decking due to extensive damage in the current roof.
- Owner's financial limits are dictated partially by what insurance will pay to replace. The DaVinci tiles are not feasible for the owner; Shayne was hesitant to present them as an option but Anaïs suggested he offer two options for Commission's consideration due to the unique characteristics of the original roof tile being replaced.
- Commissioner Brent Swift questions staff, wonders if the Preservation Guidelines specify what is allowable for roof replacement materials. Anaïs explains that the Guidelines require case-by-case consideration for alternative roof materials. The owner is changing materials, which is why they are required to come for Commission approval.
- Brent Swift is supportive of materials that avoid creating financial hardship for the applicant/owner.
- Commissioner Michael Zorba asks about quotes for typical shingles, architectural. Shayne unfortunately did not come prepared with quotes for laminated architectural shingles, but is amenable to this option.
- Brent Swift discusses shingle varieties available, including Class IV shingles, and offers information regarding other options/brands available.

Public comments consisted of:

- Russ Kaplan, neighbor, is supportive of the applicant's proposals, using any of the discussed materials.
- Marsha McDaris of 448 College questions why this extensive process is required for roofing changes; believes it should not be so difficult for owners to fix roofing damage. Brent Swift explains the need for material change oversight to maintain character of neighborhoods.

Commission discussion continues:

- Barrett Williamson is concerned about losing the unique characteristics of the original roof, namely the color/patina. Would like to see a gray shingle or similar weathered-wood look for replacement in this case. Ideal replacement may be terra cotta tile, but these are very expensive, therefore not usable in this case. Does not particularly like the slate-look because slate probably never existed on this structure. Would be happy to support a laminated architectural shingle in a color to match what is currently there. Wants to preserve as many characteristics of the original roof as possible.
- Commissioner Emily Wilkins questions staff regarding whether Commission has input on color choice; Anaïs explains that color is not a characteristic the Guidelines considers.
- Commissioner Michael Zorba is supportive of the slate-look composite tile presented, but is also supportive of the use of architectural laminated shingles, which is a more affordable option. Would like to see a similar color to the current, original roof.
- Commissioner Brent Swift thinks color of the shingles is not up to the Commission; is supportive of any architectural shingle. Wants to make it easy for the applicant to replace damaged roof.
- Commissioner Emily Wilkins requests applicant's input regarding the possible use of common architectural shingles. Applicant is happy to comply with Commission's request. Will chose a color that is as close as possible to the current color of the roof.
- Commissioner Taber Halford is supportive of the proposed change; does not want to limit the owner/applicant to use a specific color as this seems like an overstep of the Commission's guidance.

**Motion amended** by Barrett Williamson to allow for the use of common laminated architectural shingles;

**Second** by Joan Koos.

*There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:*

*The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 9-0.*

Ms. Starr noted that there is a 10-day waiting period until the COA will be issued.

\*

**Item No. 4, being: HD (22-09) Consideration of approval, rejection, amendment and/or postponement of a Certificate of Appropriateness request for replacement of vinyl siding with alternative siding material and for replacement of two windows for the property located at 508 Macy Street.**

**Motion** by Shavonne Evans to approve Item No. 4 as submitted;

**Second** by Aaron Brooks.

Anaïs Starr presented the staff report:

This is a circa 1934 bungalow, Craftsman-style, contributing house. The property owners, like the rest of the neighborhood, received damage to the vinyl siding from the

hail storm last October. They wish to replace the vinyl siding with Diamond Kote, which is a wood composite material, for durability and aesthetic reasons. Additionally, they have two windows on the front of the house on the lower level that are not original to the house and they are proposing replacing them with vinyl picture windows. The window on the right is not a true window; it is lacking a frame. Pictures of the house are presented to the Commission. Original four-over-one windows are present on some of the structure, but the house has many different types of windows, including vinyl and aluminum. Staff recognizes that this is a contributing structure, but the house is already clad in vinyl siding. The Historic Preservation Guidelines encourage the restoration of original historic wood siding material; however, it should be noted that the applicants are limited to the funds available from the insurance claim. They are requesting the wood composite as an alternative to vinyl to improve the durability and aesthetics of the structure. Staff would note that it is more appropriate for a smooth-textured Diamond Kote siding material rather than rough. Preservation Guidelines prohibit the installation of vinyl windows and encourage the installation of wood windows when possible; however, as noted, the windows being replaced are not original wood windows. Vinyl replacement is preference of the owners/applicants. It is suggested that if vinyl windows are approved, that they be of the appropriate configuration for the structure. Staff is happy to answer any questions.

- Commissioner Taber Halford questions whether wood is under the vinyl siding; this is not known currently, but the house probably has wood siding underneath the vinyl.
- Commissioner Brent Swift is curious as to the original window configuration. Recognizes the three different types of windows currently on the front of the house.

Doerte Blume, the owner, discussed the project:

Sample of Diamond Kote siding is presented to the Commission. Owner explains that the use of vinyl would be allowable, but the owners wish to upgrade the material to Diamond Kote, as this would provide more protection in future storms. She explains that they are not confident about the condition of the wood siding under the vinyl, so they wish to replace the material with composite. Doerte discusses the condition of the windows they are wanting to replace; they are not water tight and they are ugly. The house is also drafty due to the condition of the windows.

- Commissioner Barrett Williamson questions whether the owners would be amenable to a window configuration more appropriate for this structure; a pair of windows would be more authentic in this case. Owner Doerte confirms that they did not consider two separate windows initially. Answers questions about current windows and the materials.
- Owner Tom Carroll explains that the structure currently has 10 original four-over-one wood windows, 8 vinyl, 2 aluminum and there are 3 windows that are just plate glass.

Commission comments and discussion consisted of:

- Anaïs confirms they are allowed to replace vinyl windows with vinyl windows.

- Commissioner Brent Swift asks whether owners would be open to considering wood windows, or a configuration more suitable for the historic house, although this would not be their first choice.
- Commission discusses whether wood siding may be salvageable. Consensus dictates smooth siding requirement, rather than textured, as proposed for replacement.
- Commissioner Brent Swift would like to see a pair of four-over-one windows, or double window configuration to replace the windows on the front of the house. Wants to see two windows, can even be one-over-one, to maintain historic character of the house.
- Anaïs explains the owners may choose to repair/restore wood siding if its condition is found to be appropriate when vinyl siding is removed; this can be done with an administrative bypass.
- Commissioners discuss the need to amend proposal to reflect smooth-textured siding, and also adjust the configuration of the windows proposed. Picture windows are not appropriate.
- Commissioner Aaron Brooks recognizes the owner's ability to replace like-for-like, but hopes window configuration is an important characteristic to attend to.
- Emily Wilkins asks whether owners would be amenable to considering smooth-textured siding; Doerte explains they would be willing to comply with Commission's request.
- Brent Swift asks if owners are willing to consider two windows in place of the picture windows proposed. Each opening should be a pair of two windows mulled together, not picture windows, to maintain a more appropriate historic configuration. Doerte is okay with this amendment, if vinyl is allowed due to cost.
- Emily wonders if wood siding may be salvaged. Doerte is willing to consider this, but is hesitant due to the possibly poor condition of the original siding.

No public comments were made.

**Motion amended** by Brent Swift to allow smooth Diamond Kote siding, or similar smooth siding, with option to repair existing wood siding under vinyl; also amend window proposal to allow for vinyl or wood windows with configuration of one-over-one, mulled together, matching scale/size of porch window;

**Second** by Barrett Williamson.

*There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:*

*The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 9-0. Motion is passed with specified amendments of smooth siding and window configuration.*

Ms. Starr noted that there is a 10-day waiting period until the COA will be issued.

\*

**Item No. 5, being: HD (22-10) Consideration of approval, rejection, amendment and/or postponement of a Certificate of Appropriateness request for replacement of metal siding with an alternative siding material for property located at 418 Macy Street.**

**Motion** by Brent Swift to approve Item No. 5 as submitted;  
**Second** by Aaron Brooks.

Anaïs Starr presented the staff report:

This is a circa 1937 Modern-Movement style, non-contributing structure. The owners have identified damage from last October's hail storm and would like to replace metal siding with a more readily-available material, LP SmartSiding is proposed. Though this is a non-contributing structure, the Preservation Guidelines require alterations to be compatible with the district as a whole; however, the Guidelines also allow for the repair of non-original materials. In this case, the non-original metal material is not available so it may be reasonable to allow the property owner to replace the metal siding with a more durable alternative for this non-contributing structure. The Commission will need to decide whether this siding is compatible to the structure and the Historic District as a whole. Pictures are presented of the structure and proposed materials.

Greg Tiffany, the owner, discussed the project:

The siding has been damaged since the storm last October. Owners have been working with the contractor and their insurance company to try to get the work done. Insurance offered to replace roof and gutters; siding needs to be a different material because aluminum is not available. Siding has started coming down when roof was replaced. Hoping to have this request approved tonight because the owners have been waiting to get the work completed for a long time.

- Barrett Williamson asks if applicants would be okay with smooth siding; owner voices approval of this request.
- Barrett asks if wood siding is found under the metal, would the owners be willing to try to restore/repair this.
- Brent Swift wants to see smooth siding, material choice left up to the owner.

**Motion amended** by Barrett Williamson to allow smooth-finish siding in any material available for siding replacement;  
**Second** by Brent Swift.

*There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:*

*The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 9-0. Motion is passed with amendment requiring the use of smooth siding.*

Ms. Starr noted that there is a 10-day waiting period until the COA will be issued.

**Item No. 6, being: HD (22-12) Commission review and feedback regarding the proposed demolition of existing structures and the installation of a 3-car garage, driveway, swimming pool, greenhouse, carport and masonry fence for the property located at 485 College Avenue.**

Anaïs Starr presented the staff report:

Mr. Teel was granted a review/feedback session for his proposal for the demolition of structures on 485 College Ave. The house is a contributing, Colonial-revival, two-story circa 1935 structure. The wing on the front is original to the house and can be seen on the Sanborn insurance map. There was also a historic accessory structure, which has been removed, but there is another non-contributing accessory structure that was added to the parcel post 1944. The owner is interested in demolishing all of the structures on this property to allow for the addition to the primary residence on Elm street, adjacent to this lot. Owner wishes to expand his back yard and construct a swimming pool, cabana, greenhouse, driveway and 3-car garage. Pictures of the properties and drawings of proposals are submitted to the Commission. Staff mentions that owner will seek a lot-line adjustment to combine both lots. There would need to be some rezoning as well. The owner's proposal has not yet been reviewed by Planning or Public Works; may need to address allowed impervious surface ratio. Staff is happy to answer any questions.

- Mitch Baroff questions whether demolitions are allowed in the Historic Districts. Anaïs explains the demolition process, which requires City Council approval and public hearings. It is a lengthy process.

Stephen Teel, the applicant, discussed the project:

Main objective is the addition of a library to house his extensive book collection. The lot behind the main structure would be needed to comply with zoning regulations requiring impervious surface coverage, etc. Mr. Teel wants to bulldoze the structures to allow for his proposed projects. Owner is willing to do away with pool plans, or other elements of his proposal, to allow for the library addition.

Commission discussed consisted of:

- Zoning clarification. Non-conforming lot at 485 College Ave. Zoning was changed within the last 5 years.
- Chautauqua Historic District designation in 2018; Mr. Teel was not supportive of his properties being included in the Historic District.
- Commissioner Joan Koos is not supportive of the project proposal as this would disrupt the character of the neighborhood.
- Commissioner Brent Swift refers to the Missing Middle Housing Model as similar to missing a tooth, which would have a big impact on the neighborhood structure. This does not fit well with the neighborhood layout.
- Overall Commission feedback is not in favor. The proposal would disrupt the neighborhood rhythm/flow/feel in negative way and would undermine the character of the Historic District.

- Easements will need to be addressed as well; proposal drawings do not account for this.
- Formal request would be required for demolition. Unlikely to receive support from the HD Commission.
- Mitch Baroff expects the issue of the easements will need to be addressed; does not think demolition of the contributing Historic District house will be supported. Mr. Teel does not think the drawing is accurate and the easements have been/will be avoided.
- Brent Swift thinks Mr. Teel will have more luck having his proposal approved if he maintains the original contributing historic structure on college.
- Anaïs invites Mr. Teel to come back in a formal setting and discuss his proposed plans with planning and public works. Teel remembers meeting with Norman City staff a while back, at which time the process seemed easier. Anaïs explains that she was not included in that meeting, which took place in 2020, so the Historic District significance was not addressed at that time.

Public comments consisted of:

- Neighbor Loretta Bass of 440 College comments on proposal: Spoke with Nikki, neighbor directly next door to 485 College, and explains current problems with drainage runoff from the 485 College property. Does not support further development on this lot.
- Leah Kaplan of 475 College voices that she is unsupportive of this proposal as it would disrupt the neighborhood feel of the neighborhood. She does not want more parking lots.
- John Kmetz from 440 College is unsupportive of this proposal. He explains that the Commission is here to protect the neighbors from developments such as this one being proposed for 485 College. Removal of the structures would be detrimental to the nature of the neighborhood.

**Item No. 7, being: Staff report on active Certificates of Appropriateness and Administrative Bypass issued since February 7, 2022 and consideration of approval, rejection, amendment and/or postponement of six-month extension requests for expiring COAs.**

***Progress of active COA's:***

- 904 Miller—The house is again up for sale. It was recently purchased by a group out of California; claims they didn't know about the pending violation regarding windows. Staff anticipates this property to have an ongoing compliance issue for the foreseeable future. Consider future demolition support, if indicated. Structure is in poor and possibly unsafe conditions. It is not known whether the code violation was disclosed to current owner upon purchase of the property.
- 518 Chautauqua—Work continues; still waiting on windows.
- 1320 Classen—Work is finished. Still have the outstanding issue with caps on the columns.
- 620 Miller—Work has not started on the shutters.

- 518 S. Lahoma—Non-original addition and greenhouse have been removed. New addition has not started.
- 549 S. Lahoma—Applicant’s BOA appeal heard; postponed again to March.
- 503 Tulsa—Building permit issued. Work has begun.
- 506 S. Lahoma—Work has not started; no building permit yet.
- 428 Chautauqua—Building permit issued. Work has not yet started.
- 904 Classen—No progress yet.
- 514 Miller—Building permit issued. Vinyl siding has been removed.
- 521 Miller—No building permit issued yet.
- 627 E. Boyd St—Building permit issued, work not yet started.

***Administrative Bypasses Issued:***

- 514 Shawnee—Above-ground storm shelter directly behind the house; not visible from the front right-of-way.
- 406 College—removal of non-original siding and restoration of wood siding.

***Six-month extension requests: None.***

\*

**Item No. 8, being: Discussion of progress report regarding the FY 2021-2022 CLG Grant Projects.**

Anaïs Starr presented the following updates:

- Staff will not be attending the San Diego conference being held this Spring, which will result in additional CLG fund to be expended.
- Excess funds leftover from cost savings on other CLG projects allowed for second postcard mailing: Postcards were sent out recently, notifying residents of the newly-adopted Historic Preservation Guidelines. So far, only two residents have requested hard copies of the Guidelines.

\*

**Item No. 9, being: Discussion and recommendation of application for funds for the FY 2022-2023 CLG Program with the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office.**

Commission and staff discussion consisted of:

- Staff hours will be limited in coming year due to anticipated city-wide projects. Projects that are time consuming would be difficult to manage.
- Next year would recommend historic surveys.
- Walking tour app will cost roughly \$5,000.
- SHPO was supportive of quarterly mailers.
- Brent inquires about pricing of a survey; Anaïs believes it is about \$120 per property/lot.

- Emily is interested in possibly looking into another workshop, possibly a different topic. Virtual window repair workshop enrollment is still available.

**Motion** by Brent Swift to recommend the application for funds for FY 2022-2023 CLG Program;  
**Second** by Joan Koos.

*A vote on the motion was taken with the following results: The motion was passed unanimously, with a vote of 8-0. (Commissioner Barrett Williamson was not present for this vote, having left early.)*

\*

**Item No. 10, being: Miscellaneous Comments of HD Commission and City Staff.**

- Possible projects for future consideration may include some nominations to recognize “best” historic district renovation, etc. Commission was interested in this idea.

\*

**Item No. 11, being: Adjournment.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Passed and approved this 4<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2022.



Emily Wilkins, Chair  
Historic District Commission