



CITY OF NORMAN, OK
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING
Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069
Monday, September 09, 2024 at 5:30 PM

MINUTES

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers at the Norman Municipal Building on the 9th day of September, 2024, at 5:30 p.m., and notice of the agenda of the meeting was posted at the Norman Municipal Building at 201 West Gray Street and on the City website at least 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Michael Zorba called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Mitch Baroff
Taber Halford
Sarah Brewer
Karen Thurston
Susan Ford
Jo Ann Dysart
Gregory Heiser
Michael Zorba

ABSENT

Barrett Williamson

A quorum was present.

STAFF PRESENT

Anais Starr, Historic Preservation Officer, Planner II
Jeanne Snider, Assistant City Attorney
Roné Tromble, Admin. Tech. IV

GUESTS PRESENT

Linda Ozan, 800 Naz'h Zudhi Dr., Oklahoma City, OK
Michael Mapes, 800 Naz'h Zudhi Dr., Oklahoma City, OK
Ronald Frantz, 12200 Lancelot Dr., Oklahoma City, OK
Beau Jennings, 4600 Highland Lake Dr., Norman, OK
Brittani Beaver & Michael Serna, 505 Chautauqua Ave., Norman, OK
Stephanie Pilat, 1625 Crestmont Ave., Norman, OK
Matt Peacock, 2220 Westwood Dr., Norman, OK
Andrew Stone, 1118 Lombardy
Owen Love, 3101 Venice Ct., Norman, OK
Marsha McDaris, 448 College Ave., Norman, OK

MINUTES

1. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE MINUTES AS FOLLOWS: HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING OF AUGUST 5, 2024.

Motion made by Sarah Brewer, **Second** by Karen Thurston, to approve the minutes of the August 5, 2024 Historic District Commission meeting as presented.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

*

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUESTS

2. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF A RECOMMENDATION OF THE PRAIRIE HOUSE NOMINATION TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES (NRHP) LOCATED AT 550 48TH AVENUE NE, NORMAN, OKLAHOMA.

Motion made by Karen Thurston, **Second** by Sarah Brewer, to recommend the Prairie House nomination to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Linda Ozan, State Historic Preservation Office, presented the proposed nomination:

- Ms. Ozan reviewed the history of the Prairie House and the nomination to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as an example of the organic style of architecture.

Anais Starr presented the staff report:

- Ms. Starr noted that several of the Commissioners had an opportunity to tour the Prairie House, and thanked the Prairie House Society members for providing the tours.
- She discussed the importance of unique architecture such as this to Norman and Oklahoma, and the region and nation as a whole.

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Brewer spoke to the importance of the preservation of the house.
- Commissioner Halford asked the process after the Commission's recommendation.
- Ms. Ozan reported that their meeting will be October 17 at 1:30 p.m. at the Oklahoma Historical Society Building. If it is approved at that meeting, it moves to the State Historic Preservation Officer and then to the National Parks Service, where they have 45 business days to act on the nomination. If approved, it will be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
- Commissioner Ford asked if they are planning to clean up the vegetation around the building.
- Beau Jennings, Interim Executive Director of the Prairie House Preservation Society, said the plan is to clean up the vegetation. They have been working on grants to obtain funds to preserve the house, as well as clean up the vegetation.

- Ms. Starr commented that they are giving tours to help raise funds and awareness for the Prairie House. Mr. Jennings said they have paused tours for a while to work on the house.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

*

3. (HD 24-17) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 904 CLASSEN BOULEVARD FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: a) EXPOSE AND RESTORE FRONT PORCH COLUMNS; b) INSTALL SKIRT ON FRONT AND SIDE OF THE HOUSE; c) REPLACE WINDOWS WITH COMPOSITE WINDOWS ON THE EAST AND NORTH SIDES OF THE HOUSE.

Anais Starr presented the staff report:

- This is a 1913 Bungalow Craftsman style. It is non-contributing due to the fact it has had many renovations and remodels. The northeast corner of the structure originally had a porch which has been enclosed.
- The applicant has come before the Commission previously for several items, one of which was to replace the metal siding; these requests are a result of peeling off the layers in that process.

Motion made by Sarah Brewer, **Second** by Susan Ford, to approve Item 3a, Expose and restore front porch columns, as submitted.

Anais Starr presented the staff report on Item 3a:

- The porch has been enclosed. Ms. Starr reviewed photos which were submitted by the applicant. The applicant is proposing to put back the columns that were there originally; parts of the columns are still there and other parts are not. It is a non-contributing house. The applicant is proposing columns with a brick base and wood column on top for both the front and side of the house. It is a typical design seen in the Miller Historic District.
- The Guidelines for walls and porches encourage the replacement of missing features, and allow for alterations to non-contributing houses to the degree necessary to make them compatible with the rest of the neighborhood.
- The Commission would need to determine whether or not it is appropriate to restore the porch columns on this non-contributing structure. Brick and wood are compatible materials with the neighborhood.

Ryan Hauser, property owner, discussed the project:

- When the aluminum siding was applied, they followed the line of the trapezoidal columns, so the wall is sloped instead of being straight up. The base of the columns have been covered by aluminum siding. On the inside of the porch the pillars are still existing and exposed. He plans to move the wall back so it bisects the pillars in their midsection and make the wall perpendicular.
- Under the aluminum siding is a layer of asbestos shingles, tar paper, then tongue and groove solid wood.
- There currently are no brick columns. They will be faux columns because the support is currently provided by something other than brick. He wants to use old

brick. He also presented an option of brick tile (veneer) if he needed to make the column narrower.

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Brewer likes the vision and thinks it would be an improvement to the house. The lack of details is concerning. Compatibility with the neighborhood is important. She is concerned there is not enough information.
- Commissioner Zorba thinks it is important that the top cap be wider than the brick, or faux brick, column base.
- Commissioner Ford commented that a top cap could be built to overlap the brick column, so it looks stepped. She likes the idea of exposing the columns.
- Commissioner Halford would like to see construction details.
- Commissioner Brewer would like the brick to be wider than shown in the drawings.
- Commissioner Thurston commented that there are many styles of columns; the size of the top cap dictates the size of the pillar. She needs more detail before she can vote, because she doesn't know what she is approving.
- Commissioner Halford expressed concern that the northeast corner may present issues that have not been considered because we don't know what is under the siding.
- Mr. Hauser clarified that all the wood columns are the same shape and they're all tapered. There will be three wood columns.
- Commissioner Zorba suggested that the applicant consider postponing this item and come back with more detail, including dimensions.
- Mr. Hauser said he would like to postpone this item. He might be able to expose more under the siding, and get samples of the brick and tile. He can also provide pictures of the inside.
- Commissioner Ford suggested that the applicant provide one drawing of the column, the cap, the base and all the dimensions and materials.

Motion made by Sarah Brewer to postpone Item 3a to a future meeting; **Second** by Susan Ford.

The motion to postpone Item 3a to a future meeting passed unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

*

Motion made by Susan Ford to approve Item 3b, Install skirt on front and side of house, as submitted; **Second** by Sarah Brewer.

Anais Starr presented the staff report on Item 3b:

- Ms. Starr reported that the applicant needs to do something with the northeast corner where he removed some of the aluminum siding. He wants to make it aesthetically better than it was with a weatherproof material. A brick skirt is something that you do see in the Miller Historic District.

Ryan Hauser, property owner, discussed the project:

- Mr. Hauser noted that the skirt is just around the porch. The skirt on the rest of the house is cement.
- He originally thought there was brick under the siding because he could see the brick base, but there are only two rows of brick which provide the base for the stud wall. He would like to use brick tile to cover the skirt, and match the brick columns.
- When the aluminum siding is removed, you have asbestos tile, over tongue and groove.

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Baroff suggested this be postponed so the applicant can provide specific details.
- Commissioner Ford asked what would support the brick tiles. Mr. Hauser responded that he proposed to use Durarock sheets, nailed to the studs.
- Commissioner Dysart asked if the material wrapping the columns should be the same as the skirt.
- Commissioner Zorba commented that he could have wood siding for the skirt and brick for the columns. He does not have a problem with either brick or wood skirt.
- Commissioner Halford commented that the applicant was previously approved to replace the skirt with the siding. It would not be his preference to add in another material.
- Commissioner Thurston would like to see more detail, or exactly what is being proposed.
- Mr. Hauser said he should postpone this item, because he can't do one without the other.

Motion made by Sarah Brewer to postpone Item 3b to a future meeting; **Second** by Karen Thurston.

The motion to postpone Item 3b to a future meeting passed unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

*

Motion by Gregory Heiser to approve Item 3c, Replace windows with composite windows on the east and north sides of the house, as submitted; **Second** by Sarah Brewer.

Anais Starr presented the staff report on Item 3c:

- Ms. Starr reported that there are a variety of windows that the applicant is wanting to replace with fiberglass windows, to bring some uniformity to the window configurations. He would also like to change the window opening size on the front so they match.
- The Commission has previously approved aluminum-clad windows for non-contributing structures; they have not approved fiberglass. When the Preservation Guidelines were amended, fiberglass windows were added as an option on non-contributing structures.

Ryan Hauser, property owner, discussed the project:

- Mr. Hauser wants to replace the windows on the enclosed porch and make them all uniform and operational, with the same 6-over-1 grid pattern. The bay window would retain the same grid pattern as currently exists.
- The windows on the back of the house were replaced some time ago with 6-over-1 grid pattern that he would like to match.
- He would also like to add matching grids where none exist.
- Commissioner Halford asked about the bay windows that were recently replaced.
- Mr. Hauser explained that his dog broke the window and he had to replace it with something. He knew it might not get approved. He replaced the two side windows in the front bay with 6-over-1 configuration fiberglass for symmetrical reasons.
- Commissioner Ford asked about the center windows in the north side bay.
- Mr. Hauser stated they will be replaced with windows exactly the same size and configuration.

Public Comments:

- Michael Bewley, 2815 Short Drive in Edmond, explained that with an aluminum-clad window, the whole window is still wood with aluminum on the outside of the wood. He displayed a sample. Fiberglass windows can be wood in the middle with fiberglass coating on both sides, or it can be fiberglass all the way through. Both look similar.

Commission Discussion:

- Ms. Starr commented that the Commission has not approved fiberglass, but no one has requested fiberglass windows.
- Commissioner Brewer asked if the muntins are on the outside of the window. Mr. Hauser said he has been told they can be on the outside, or the windows can have separate panes. The windows in the house that were previously replaced has the grid just on the inside.
- Commissioner Ford likes the idea of making all the windows uniform, and it will elevate the look of the house. She thinks it is possible to get wood mullions on the outside without requiring separate panes. She likes the idea of fixing the heights to make the windows look uniform. She does not have a problem with fiberglass.
- Commissioner Zorba agreed.
- Commissioner Brewer said she is fine with fiberglass windows since the house is non-contributing. She would like to see the muntins on the outside of the window so it looks like a wood window.
- Commissioner Halford commented that grids on the outside or inside can be popped on or off.
- Commissioner Zorba asked if there is any cost difference in the types of windows. Mr. Hauser thinks fiberglass are a little more cost effective than aluminum-clad. He agrees with having the muntins on the outside.
- Commissioner Halford commented that fiberglass windows look significantly different. Aluminum-clad windows look more like wood windows.

- Commissioner Brewer commented that there are already various window types and sizes in this house that don't match. She is okay with fiberglass windows in this specific case.
- Commissioner Thurston commented that she doesn't want to set a precedent of replacing all the windows, but this house is extremely unique in that it has so many different types and sizes of windows.

Motion by Susan Ford to amend the motion to require exterior mullions and muntins on the windows; **Second** by Sarah Brewer.

The amendment to require exterior mullions and muntins on the windows was adopted by a vote of 7-1, with Commissioner Halford voting against.

The motion to approve Item 3c as amended was adopted by a vote of 7-1, with Commissioner Halford voting against.

*

RECESS 7:14 to 7:20

*

4. (HD 24-18) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 505 CHAUTAUQUA AVENUE FOR THE FOLLOWING: A) DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE; B) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW HOUSE WITH AN ATTACHED GARAGE AND AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT; C) INSTALLATION OF WROUGHT IRON OR ALUMINUM-CLAD FRENCH DOORS; D) APPLICATION OF PROPOSED EXTERIOR MATERIAL.

Anais Starr presented the staff report:

- There was originally a house that burned down quite some time ago, possibly in the 1980s.
- The new owners are proposing a new home.
- The original garage is still existing; the proposal is to remove it. They will be retaining the driveway location with ribbon driveway.
- They are proposing a brick house with attached garage and accessory dwelling unit in the rear, not visible from the front.
- They have asked for the brick to have a slurry coat.
- They have also requested a steel/wrought iron or aluminum-clad French door.

Motion made by Sarah Brewer to approve Item 4a, Demolition of existing garage, as requested; **Second** by Commissioner Ford.

Anais Starr presented the staff report on Item 4a:

- Ms. Starr reported they are proposing to demolish the existing garage due to it's small size and deteriorated state.
- She displayed photos showing the deteriorated state of the structure.
- The structure is historic, but lost its historic significance due to the fact that the main structure burned down. The Guidelines support the removal or demolition of a structure that meets one of the five criteria in the Guidelines. This garage

is too small to park a normal car in it, but is also very dilapidated and would require extensive renovation in order to repair.

Michael Bewley, representing the applicant,

- Mr. Buley said they were interested in trying to keep the structure and do something with it, like a garden shed, but the slab is in disrepair and it is not a safe structure.

Public Comments:

- Marsha McDaris, 448 College Avenue, commented that this property backs up to her house. She does not have a problem with the garage being removed.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Halford commented that this meets the Guidelines, and the garage is in terrible condition and is not really salvageable, nor does it make sense for any project on this lot.
- Commissioner Zorba agreed.

The motion to approve Item 4a was adopted unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

*

Motion made by Gregory Heiser to approve Item 4b, Construction of a new house with an attached garage and an accessory dwelling unit, as requested; **Second** by Jo Ann Dysart.

Anais Starr presented the staff report on Item 4b:

- Construction of a new house is allowed by the Guidelines. It is supposed to be a house of its own time; you are not to mimic or duplicate a house in the neighborhood. It should be compatible with the neighborhood: size, scale and height.
- At the August meeting, the Commission suggested they bring down the height of the house, which they have so it now matches the house to the south.
- They are proposing a total of 4,032 sq. ft. under roof. The footprint will be approximately 2,054 sq. ft., which includes the attached garage, accessory dwelling unit, front porch, and screened patio on the south side.
- They are proposing a 20' front setback to be in line with the other structures on their side of the street; they will have to go to the Board of Adjustment to make that request. The Commission can approve the design contingent upon the Board of Adjustment granting the variance.
- The placement of the house is similar to other houses on the block.
- It is a two-story house, and there are two-story houses in the neighborhood.
- The finished floor elevation will be 24" from the ground, which is similar to 447 Chautauqua to the north, but is lower than 507 Chautauqua.
- The drawing depicts a transom above the front door, but there will not be one.
- They will be removing 5 of the 12 existing trees; they wish to retain as many as possible.
- The Commission suggested they change the front door from a double door to a single door, which they did. The Commission also suggested the primary entry have a sidewalk to it to make it a focal point, which they have done.

- The garage will be 576 sq. ft.; 575 sq. ft. is supported by the Guidelines. It will be at the rear of the house. The Commission asked that the garage door have recessed panels, which they will do.
- The accessory dwelling unit will be on the rear and is allowed in the R-1 zone. It will be 483 sq. ft. and is not visible from the front.
- Commissioner Brewer questioned whether aluminum-clad doors can be used for the main entry. The Guidelines indicate they cannot.

Michael Buley, 2815 Short Drive in Edmond, and Owen Love, 3101 Venice Court, presented the project for the applicants:

- The front of the house faces west, so it would be really difficult to maintain a true wood door, which is why they proposed an aluminum-clad door.
- Commissioner Brewer noted at the last meeting the windows were 3-over-1, but now it is showing 2-over-2. Mr. Bewley responded that they will be using 1-over-1 as a cost saving measure. They kept the divided windows on the front and on the side where the stairs will be. On the side of the house under the trees you really won't see the windows.
- Commissioner Thurston asked whether the two front doors will be matching. Mr. Love said they match in the drawing, other than one is a single door and one is a double door. There is an alternative that the homeowners like for the French door that they would like to present as an option, and they would no longer be matching. There are examples in the neighborhood where two doors don't exactly match.

Public Comments:

- Marsha McDaris, 448 College, said her house is almost identical to the proposal in that she has an attached garage with a room above it. Her concern is whether this house will be able to back out of the garage and pull forward onto the street. All the houses on this block have detached garages. She is concerned about the trees on the property because it has not been taken care of for several years. The house to the north has high weeds and there is a problem with rats. There is a huge magnolia tree in the back yard which is getting into the power lines and causing power outages.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Halford commented that the attached garage adds to the modern day convenience and there is not a lot of space on the lot. He also supports the ADU.
- Commissioner Brewer agreed, and noted that the garage door is concealed.
- Commissioner Halford commented that with the front doors being somewhat enclosed it somewhat obscures the view of the doors and he is not concerned about an aluminum-clad door. He is comfortable with the style.
- Commissioner Ford likes the style of the house and thinks it fits in the neighborhood.
- Commissioner Zorba appreciates that they reduced the height.

The motion to approve Item 4b was adopted unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

*

Motion made by Sarah Brewer to approve Item 4c, Installation of wrought iron or aluminum-clad French doors, as requested; **Second** by Susan Ford.

Anais Starr presented the staff report on Item 4c:

- The applicants found another option for the French doors. Wrought iron is not something the Commission has approved previously, but it has also not been requested.

Michael Buley presented the project for the applicants:

- They have a more traditional French door option. All of it is wrought iron. The applicants really like the look, and it will help give the study area a slightly different feel and look.
- Commissioner Ford noted the color matches the front door, and the curved windows echo the curve above the front door entry.

Public Comments:

- Marsha McDaris commented that solid wood doors are problematic with the humidity and the weather.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Brewer likes the door but doesn't feel it is compatible with the neighborhood. The doors in the drawing look more like windows and feel more compatible to the neighborhood.
- Commissioner Zorba likes the matching doors.
- Commissioner Heiser commented that some of the Guidelines are very specific, and others are very general. The expectation that new construction will match a neighborhood is about as general as the Guidelines can get. He is inclined to give as much discretion to the builder/homeowner as possible.
- Commissioner Baroff likes the look of the house. The neighborhood is so varied that it's hard to get caught up on small details. It is a very nice house, and he has no problems with it.

The motion to approve Item 4c was adopted unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

*

Motion made by Gregory Heiser to approve Item 4d, Application of proposed exterior material, as requested; **Second** by Susan Ford.

Anais Starr presented the staff report on Item 4d:

- At the August meeting the Commission indicated painted brick was not compatible with the neighborhood.
- They are now proposing a slurry finish. It has been approved once before at 415 S. Lahoma; it was cinderblock and with the slurry now looks like stucco. There are other stucco houses in the neighborhood.

- Commissioner Thurston asked if it is a smooth stucco or more brick, like the pictures.

Michael Buley presented the project for the applicants:

- It is a brick house. The process is called German schmear; it is slurried onto the bricks. You can still see the individual bricks. It is a very permanent product. The brick will have white and tan undertones under the slurry.
- There is a house in Rivendell with this finish.
- Commissioner Ford asked how the finish weathers. Mr. Buley responded that it is the same as normal mortar. The slurry is applied to clean brick in a very intentional way.

Public Comments:

- Marsha McDaris thinks it looks good. She asked if they are aware the Hardie board on the ADU has to be smooth.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Halford likes it. He didn't want to set a precedent for painting brick in an historic neighborhood, even on a non-contributing structure. This is not painting the brick; it allows it to breathe; and it gives it a different look.
- Commissioner Brewer agreed.
- Commissioner Ford thinks it is a good compromise, and it looks stone-like so it won't be mistaken for paint.

The motion to approve Item 4d was adopted unanimously by a vote of 8-0.

*

REPORTS/UPDATES

5. STAFF REPORT ON ACTIVE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE BYPASS ISSUED SINCE AUGUST 5, 2024.

- 549 S. Lahoma Ave. – In the process of making them apply for the windows that they didn't win in Court. They have been given some amount of time to apply.
- 514 Miller Ave. – They are having difficulties completing the job and have not started on it. They have a building permit, which has been extended.
- 904 Classen Blvd. – They are replacing the siding; it is in progress.
- 607/609 S. Lahoma Ave. – Restor will let Ms. Starr know when they install the window.
- 425 Chautauqua Ave. – There are no updated photos.
- 626 Tulsa St. – They are considering coming back for an amendment to bring down the cost of the addition.
- 712 Miller Ave. – Work has not started.
- 423 S. Lahoma Ave. – No updated photo.
- 444 College Ave. – The frame is up for the screened in porch on the rear.
- 485 College Ave. – Work has not started.
- 1320 Oklahoma Ave. – Building permit has been submitted, but is not yet approved.

- 515 Miller Ave. – Work has not started.
- 800 Miller Ave. – They have a COA for the rear yard fence.

*

6. DISCUSSION OF PROGRESS REPORT REGARDING FY 2024-2025 CLG GRANT PROJECTS.

- The same as August. Ms. Starr is working on the Southridge Walking Tour.
- The National Alliance for Preservation Commissions suggested 2-3 evening or 1-2 Saturdays for CAMP. It could be done in one whole day. This will be Essentials of Preservation Commissions. The preference expressed by Commissioners was for late afternoon/evening.

*

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

- Ms. Starr commented that this has been an extremely busy summer. She has been considering a change in the filing deadline to allow more time for preparation of staff reports. That change would have to be brought forward as a Zoning Ordinance amendment.
- Ms. Starr asked Commissioners to do their homework and review the applications prior to the meeting so they can ask any questions they may have ahead of time.

*

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

Passed and approved this 7 day of October, 2024.


 Michael Zorba, Chair