

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES OF

May 2, 2022

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met for the Regular Meeting on May 2, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. Notice and Agenda of the meeting were posted at 201 West Gray, Building A, the Norman Municipal Complex and at www.Normanok.gov 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Emily Wilkins called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Item No. 1, being: Roll Call.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joan Koos
 Taber Halford
 Emily Wilkins
 Barrett Williamson
 Mitch Baroff
 Aaron Brooks
 Brent Swift*

MEMBERS ABSENT: Michael Zorba
 Shavonne Evans

A quorum was present.

*Commissioner Brent Swift arrived at 5:33 PM.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Anaïs Starr, Planner II, Historic Preservation Officer
 Jessica Steele, Admin Tech III

GUESTS: Chuck & Dana Anderson, applicants for 106 E Symmes

*

Item No. 2, being: Approval of the minutes from the April 4, 2022 Meeting.

Motion by Barrett Williamson for approval of the minutes from the April 4, 2022 regular meeting;

Second by Aaron Brooks.

The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0. Minutes from the previous meeting were approved. (Brent Swift was not present for this vote.)

*

Item No. 3, being: HD (22-16) Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness request for the replacement of composite roof shingles with an alternative roof material for the property located at 106 E Symmes Street.

Motion by Barrett Williamson to approve Item No. 3 as submitted;

Second by Aaron Brooks.

Anaïs Starr presented the staff report:

The house at 106 E Symmes is a circa 1923 National Folk design. It is a non-contributing structure due to loss of integrity. The applicants, Chuck and Dana, suffered damage to this structure from the hailstorm last October. The Andersons have a metal roof on their own house, which is not located in the Historic District, and believed it would be a great solution for this house. Since it is a non-contributing resource, the Andersons purchased the metal roofing material, believing they could add such a roof to a non-contributing structure. The Andersons indicated that the home is basically in the same form as when it was built in 1923 and no additions have been added. The Andersons are seeking approval to install a metal roof on this non-contributing resource. The Commission will need to determine whether a metal roof is appropriate for this non-contributing structure, and if it is compatible with the surrounding Historic District. After staff report presentation, Ms. Starr answered Commissioners' questions.

- Chair Wilkins confirmed with Ms. Starr that the metal roof material had not been installed yet. Ms. Starr explained that the material had been purchased, but not installed.
- Commissioner Baroff asked why the structure is non-contributing. Ms. Starr explained that modifications, including vinyl siding that encases the house, replacement windows, and possibly some front porch alterations amounted to a loss of historical integrity, thus making the property non-contributing to the Miller Historic District.
- Commissioner Koos asked if there had been any requests for metal roofs. Ms. Starr explained that this is the first request for a metal roof installation that the Commission has reviewed.

Chuck Anderson, the property owner, discussed the project:

The applicant explained that he and his wife had lived in the area prior to the Historic District designation and had even advocated for the Historic designation. They stated that they are supporters of historic preservation. Dr. Anderson stated that they desired to use a metal roof because of the durability and environmental friendliness. He further stated that he had purchased the metal roof material without realizing there would be Guidelines for a non-contributing structure.

No public comments were made.

Commission discussion consisted of:

- Commissioner Swift asked Ms. Starr whether the Guidelines specify anything about metal roofs. She explained that the Guidelines state all alternative material requests must come before the Commission to decide whether the use is appropriate on a case-by-case basis; metal would be an alternative material in this case. Mr. Swift clarified; “alternative” means a material other than asphalt. Ms. Starr confirmed this clarification.
- Commissioner Williamson asked Ms. Starr if there were any other metal roofs found in the Historic Districts. Ms. Starr stated that a metal-roofed house can be found on College Ave, in the Chautauqua Historic District, which was grandfathered in when College was made part of the Chautauqua Historic District. She further stated that the Miller Historic District does not have any structures with metal roofs.
- Commissioner Swift was curious whether the Preservation Guidelines historically included any specifications for metal roofs. Ms. Starr indicated that there had not been and elaborated that the intent of the Preservation Guideline has always been to keep original historic materials, such as red clay tiles, etc. Ms. Starr explained that she had received calls in the past with residents who were curious about using metal roofs, but applications were never submitted.
- Ms. Starr explained that from her interpretation of the Preservation Guidelines, the use of metal roofs on historic structures would probably not be appropriate. But with a non-historic house, it is not as clear.
- Commissioner Halford voiced his opinion that a metal roof on this structure would greatly detract from the atmosphere of the Miller Historic District; he was not in favor of this proposal.
- Commissioner Williamson agreed with Mr. Halford and added that he does not wish to see approval of a metal roof, in this case, setting a precedent. Mr. Williamson felt that the metal material proposed for this roof would be more appropriate for use in agricultural buildings, warehouses, metal buildings, etc., not on a house in a Historic District. Mr. Williamson also added that he found no other metal roofs in the surrounding Historic District.
- Commissioner Swift offered his experience with metal roofs. He explained that metal roofs may well last 14+ years; hail damage could be seen but roof technically remained intact. Mr. Swift further discussed logical design aspect for this property, but admitted that he does not have a strong feeling either way in this case.
- Commissioner Baroff explained his disapproval of the proposed metal roof in this case. Mr. Baroff believed metal roof material would detract from the historic integrity of the District.
- Commissioner Brooks stated that he disagreed with the other Commissioners’ interpretation of the Guidelines in this case. He respects the applicant’s desire to choose a material that is more environmentally friendly and durable, to withstand the hailstorms and other inclement weather. Mr. Brooks indicated his support of the request, as submitted.
- Commissioner Koos explained that she was partial to asphalt shingles in the Historic District. She believed that a metal roof would change the look of the neighborhood to an unacceptable degree.

- Commissioner Swift confirmed with Ms. Starr that there have been no requests for metal roofs. Ms. Starr clarified: There is a metal roof on College, which was grandfathered in to the Chautauqua Historic District. She explained, in that case, the visual impact of the metal roof is highly evident and sharply contrasts with the surrounding neighborhood.
- Commissioner Williamson discussed that the national standard for replacement of more-historic materials, such as shake or wood roofs, would be an architectural asphalt shingle, or “fake shake” as he referred to it. He explained that he would be inclined to disapprove of any alternative material proposal for roof replacement in this specific case; he believed architectural shingles would be the most appropriate choice for replacement.
- Commissioner Brooks believed this approval would not set a precedent; voiced his support of the change of material to metal.
- Chair Wilkins disagreed with Commissioner Brooks; she believed a metal roof would negatively affect the atmosphere of the Miller Historic District.

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

YEAS:

Aaron Brooks

NAYS:

Mitch Baroff

Taber Halford

Joan Koos

Barrett Williamson

Brent Swift

Emily Wilkins

The motion failed with a vote of 6-1.

Ms. Starr noted that the applicants could choose to appeal this decision with the Board of Adjustment; she offered her assistance with this process if the applicants chose to go this route. The applicants explained that they were satisfied with the Commission’s decision and verbalized agreement to use asphalt shingles for roof replacement at 106 E. Symmes.

*

Ms. Starr suggested that, due to impending inclement weather, the Commission could consider postponement of the remaining agenda items to another set time.

Motion by Barrett Williamson to postpone the remaining items to May 9th at 5:30;

Second by Joan Koos.

A vote on the motion was taken with the following results:

The motion failed unanimously, with a vote of 7-0. In discussion, Commissioners realized that postponement was not required, as there were no outstanding items on the agenda needing a formal vote.

*

Item No. 4, being: HD (22-17) Commission review and feedback regarding proposed siding replacement with alternative material for the property located at 616 Miller Avenue.

NOTE: Applicant was not present due to prior notification of meeting postponement for impending inclement weather.

Commissioners discussed providing feedback via email; however, discussion continued and Commissioners gave feedback indicating that the request to remove historic siding would not meet the Guidelines. Ms. Starr verbalized her intention to follow up with the applicant regarding Commission's feedback.

Remaining Agenda **Items No. 5-8** to be continued at the next regularly scheduled meeting, which is to be held on June 6, 2022.

*

Item No. 9, being: Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

Passed and approved this _____th day of _____, 2022.

Emily Wilkins, Chair
Historic District Commission