BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
CASE REPORT

STR: 9307
CZM: 37
CD: 4

Case Number: BOA-23086

HEARING DATE: 03/09/2021 1:00 PM

APPLICANT: Andrew Kern

ACTION REQUESTED: Appeal of a decision by the Tulsa Preservation Commission to deny Historic Preservation Permit Application (HP-0239-2020) to permit the installation of rooftop solar panels (Sec. 70.070-L)

LOCATION: 1540 S GILLETTE AV E
ZONED: RS-3

PRESENT USE: Residential
TRACT SIZE: 10911.82 SQ FT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: S40.5 LT 10 & N34.5 LT 11 BLK 2, HOPPING'S ADDN

RELEVANT PREVIOUS ACTIONS:

Subject property:

BOA-19607; On 06.10.03 the Board denied a variance to allow a two-story detached building and a variance of the maximum size limit for a detached accessory building.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The Tulsa Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property as part of an "Existing Neighborhood" and an "Area of Stability".

An Existing Neighborhood is intended to preserve and enhance Tulsa's existing single-family neighborhoods. Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and small-scale infill projects, as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of the zoning code.

The Areas of Stability include approximately 75% of the city's total parcels. Existing residential neighborhoods, where change is expected to be minimal, make up a large proportion of the Areas of Stability. The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and small-scale infill projects. The concept of stability and growth is specifically designed to enhance the unique qualities of older neighborhoods that are looking for new ways to preserve their character and quality of life. The concept of stability and growth is specifically designed to enhance the unique qualities of older neighborhoods that are looking for new ways to preserve their character and quality of life.

ANALYSIS OF SURROUNDING AREA: The subject tract is in the Swan Lake Historical Preservation Overlay District.
STAFF COMMENTS: The applicant is appealing the decision by the Tulsa Preservation Commission to deny Historic Preservation Permit Application (HP-0239-2020) to permit the installation of roof-top solar panels (Sec. 70.070-L)

70.070-L Appeals
Any final decision of the preservation commission may be appealed to the board of adjustment in accordance with Section 70.140.

70.140-G Hearing and Final Decision
1. The board of adjustment must hold a public hearing on the appeal.
2. Following the close of the public hearing, the board of adjustment must make its findings and take action on the appeal.
3. In exercising the appeal power, the board of adjustment has all the powers of the administrative official from whom the appeal is taken. The board of adjustment may affirm or may, upon the concuring vote of at least 3 members, reverse, wholly or in part, or modify the decision being appealed.
4. In acting on the appeal, the board of adjustment must grant to the official's decision a presumption of correctness, placing the burden of persuasion of error on the appellant.

70.140-H Review Criteria
The decision being appealed may be reversed or wholly or partly modified only if the board of adjustment finds that the land use administrator, the development administrator or other administrative official erred.

In deciding the Board may look to Sec. 70.070-F which outlines the Standards and Review Criteria for which the Preservation Commission must look to in making their decisions: '}

70.070-F Standards and Review Criteria
In its review of HP permit applications, the preservation commission must use the adopted design guidelines to evaluate the proposed work and must, to the greatest extent possible, strive to affect a fair balance between the purposes and intent of HP district regulations and the desires and need of the property owner. In addition, the preservation commission must consider the following specific factors:
1. The degree to which the proposed work is consistent with the applicable design guidelines;
2. The degree to which the proposed work would destroy or alter all or part of the historic resource;
3. The degree to which the proposed work would serve to isolate the historic resource from its surroundings, or introduce visual elements that are out of character with the historic resource and its setting, or that would adversely affect the physical integrity of the resource;
4. The degree to which the proposed work is compatible with the significant characteristics of the historic resource; and
5. The purposes and intent of the HP district regulations and this zoning code.
In your packets are supporting materials provided by both the applicant and the Historic Preservation Planner for the City of Tulsa.

The applicant provided the following comments as their stated request:

Installation of 6 solar panels on the south side roof of the porch, not visible from the vast majority of public vantage points along Gillette Avenue (see reference materials). Solar panel configuration and type will resemble a skylight, in which there are numerous examples throughout the historic districts of Tulsa visible from public vantage points (see reference materials provided). The home was built in 2005 and is a Non-Contributing Structure per Section E of the Unified Design Guidelines – the proposed installation is a product of the home’s own time. The proposed installation will have minimal impact per Section A of the Unified Design Guidelines. At the Tulsa Preservation Commission meeting on December 10th, 2020 proposed installation of 6 solar panels received 2 votes in favor. On January 26th, 2021 a similar proposed installation of solar panels received 2 votes in favor.

Though a hardship is not a necessary finding the applicant provided the following information regarding their request:

*Please state your hardship:* We currently have solar panels that provide electricity for our home at less than 100% of our electricity usage. We’ve permitted and installed as many solar panels in the backyard area as possible that has adequate sun exposure. Installation of these solar panels on the south side roof of the porch, combined with the solar panels in the backyard, will provide approximately 100% of our electricity usage. This will virtually eliminate our electrical bills, reduce electrical line maintenance costs for the utility, provide work for the solar panel installers, and improve public health.

Applicant Signature:

**SAMPLE MOTION:** Move to __________ (affirm/reverse) the decision by the Tulsa Preservation Commission to deny Historic Preservation Permit Application (HP-0239-2020) to permit the installation of roof-top solar panels

**Case No. 19606**

**Action Requested:**
Variance of required frontage in an IM District to 0’ to permit lot-split #19540. 

**SECTION 903. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS, located S of E. 11th St., W of S. Lewis Ave.**

**Presentation:**
Mike Marrara, 9936 E. 55th Pl., stated this application is to create two tracts. There is an existing cell tower on Tract 1 and Tract 2 has two existing metal buildings. There is a mutual access easement through Tract 2 to Tract 1. The hardship is the unique configuration of being railroad right-of-way originally. It is not platted with street frontage, and is a court ordered sale, which has some bearing on the latitude they have to split the property. A site plan was provided (Exhibit E-1).

**Interested Parties:**
There were no interested parties present who wished to speak.

**Board Action:**
On MOTION of Cooper, the Board voted 3-0-1 (Dunham, Turnbo, Cooper "aye"; no "nays"; White "abstained"; Perkins "absent") to APPROVE a Variance of required frontage in an IM District to 0’ to permit lot-split #19540, finding it does not have the required frontage now, and with condition for an access easement for Tract 1 through Tract 2, per plan, finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

A tract of land in the NE/4 of Section 7, T-19-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, being more particularly described as follows: Commencing at a point of intersection of the former Wly right-of-way line of the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company with the W line of S. Lewis Ave. and the E line of Lot 4, Block 7, Terrace Drive Addition; thence N 31°43'39" W along said former Wly railroad right-of-way a distance of 332.00' to a point on the center of the 12th St. right-of-way where it intersects such former Wly railroad right-of-way line, said point being the POB; thence continuing N 31°43'39" W a distance of 293.00'; thence N 58°16'21" E a distance of 50.00'; thence S 31°43'39" E a distance of 293.00'; thence S 58°16'21" W a distance of 50.00' to the POB.

**Case No. 19607**

**Action Requested:**
Variance to allow a two-story accessory building from 18' to 20'6". SECTION 210.B.5.a. PERMITTED OBSTRUCTIONS IN REQUIRED YARDS; and a Variance.
of allowable square feet for accessory building from 1,068 square feet (40% of residence) to 1,377 square feet. SECTION 402.B.1.d. ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6, located 1540 S. Gillette.

Presentation:
Mr. Beach mentioned that staff did not receive a site plan. He stated the location of the accessory building on the lot would be important.

Jo Glenn, 2425 S. Troost, attorney for Sandra Jackson, stated the house was removed. She showed photos on a lap top to the Board; a site plan and a photograph were submitted (Exhibits F-2, F-1 and F-3). There are a lot of trees and a privacy fence that will provide plenty of screening. It is in the historical district and one of the requirements is for a detached garage. That is the reason for this application. Ms. Glenn pointed out where there are garage apartments and a duplex with garage apartment in the neighborhood. She assured the Board that the room above the garage on the subject property would be a game room, not an apartment.

Comments and Questions:
Ms. Turnbo asked if they had been before the Historic Preservation Commission for approval of this plan. Ms. Glenn replied that according to the builder it was. Ms. Turnbo asked her to be sure the approval is provided in writing to Mr. Beach if the Board is inclined to approve. Ms. Glenn stated that the owner wants to conform to the neighborhood and also meet her own needs. They only need an extra two and one half feet to have a detached garage in keeping with the historical neighborhood. She showed a slide presentation and submitted the CD to the Board (Exhibit F-2).

Interested Parties:
Judy Hollingsworth, 1527 S. Gillette Ave., submitted a letter (Exhibit F-4) that was sent to the neighbors from Mr. Marshall, the builder. She stated her concern that there are three legal non-conforming used garage apartment quarters on Gillette St. (Exhibit F-5) This application would open the door for another apartment. Mr. Dunham commented that the Board can make it a condition of the approval that the second floor of the garage not be used for a residence. The existing garage apartments are non-conforming and have been there for a long time. The Board cannot do anything about them. She submitted a photograph (Exhibit F-3) showing the numerous cars parked on the street. She also noted that it does not meet the criteria as defined by the code.

Sherry White, 1518 S. Gillette, pointed out that the number two item listed in the builder’s letter is a self-imposed hardship and is financial. She reminded the Board that the preservation commission does not have prevue over garages, so it could not be approved by the commission. Ms. White pointed out that the garage apartments pointed out by the previous interested party were over two-car garages not three-car garages. She noted that the hardships listed do not meet the
definition of the code: new construction, the owner's needs and building in a historic district.

**Phillip Marshall**, 4319 S. Quincy Pl., stated he is the builder. He indicated that he should not have included the garage in his letter regarding approval by the Historic Preservation Commission. He informed the Board he sent out letters to the neighbors in the Gillette district, but they did not contact him to discuss the plans. There will be no kitchen or kitchen plumbing in the second floor of the garage.

**Applicant's Rebuttal:**
Ms. Glenn reminded the Board that her client does not want to rent the garage. They only need the extra two and one half feet of height, and it will still be eight feet lower than the house.

**Board Action:**
On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 2-2-0 (White, Dunham "aye"; Turnbo, Cooper "nay"; no "abstentions"; Perkins "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Variance** to allow a two-story accessory building from 18' to 20'6"; and a **Variance** of allowable square feet for accessory building from 1,068 square feet (40% of residence) to 1,377 square feet, finding the garage would be eight feet shorter than the house, and finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan. The **motion failed** for lack of three affirmative votes, regarding the following described property:

S 40.5' of Lot 10 and N 34.5' Lot 11, Block 2, Hoppings Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

**********

**Case No. 19608**

**Action Requested:**
Variance of the required setback from centerline of East 71st Street from 110' to 100' for existing building. **SECTION 702. ACCESSORY USES PERMITTED IN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 12, located E of NE/c E. 71st St. & S. Lewis.

**Presentation:**
**Michael Joyce**, 3800 First Place Tower, 15 E. 5th, stated he represents the property owner. This is to correct an existing condition for a title insurance policy. A site plan and applicant's packet were provided (Exhibits G-1 and G-2).

**Interested Parties:**
There were no interested parties present who wished to speak.

**Board Action:**
February 23, 2021

City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment
2 West Second Street – Suite 800
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103

RE: Appeal of the Denial of the Application for Historic Preservation Permit Number HP-0239-2020

Dear Members of the Board of Adjustment:

On January 26, 2021, the Tulsa Preservation Commission disapproved a proposal for the installation of three (3) solar panels on the roof of the residence located at 1540 South Gillette Avenue, because the panels would have been visible from the right-of-way, creating an adverse effect on the residence and the Gillette Historic Preservation Overlay District. According to Section 70.070-F of the Zoning Code, the Tulsa Preservation Commission should rely on the Unified Design Guidelines during evaluation of a proposal and strive to balance the intention of the guidelines with the needs of the owner. As directed by the Zoning Code, among the factors which the Tulsa Preservation Commission must consider is the degree to which the proposed project is consistent with the guidelines, particularly in this case Guidelines A.7.6, E.1.2, and E.1.4:

- **Guideline A.7.6**
  Install systems requiring exterior components, such as solar panels or devices, where they will have minimal impact, preferably at the rear of your house or yard or on an outbuilding. Install exterior components on a historic building in a manner that does not damage the historic roofing material or negatively impact the building’s historic character and is reversible. These considerations will be made on a case-by-case basis.

- **Guideline E.1.2**
  Non-contributing structures will be considered products of their own time. Do not attempt to create a false appearance of the predominant character and architectural style of the rest of the district.

- **Guideline E.1.4**
  Ensure that work on non-contributing structures does not detract from or diminish the historic character of the overall district.

Foremost among the factors considered in the review of the application was the impact of the visibility of the solar panels. Presented in the documentation submitted with the appeal are images of skylights and awnings installed on residences elsewhere in the Gillette Historic Preservation Overlay District and in other districts, which the appellant contends would be more visible than the solar panels. A review of our records revealed that those installations occurred prior to the implementation of the Historic Preservation Overlay or after its implementation without the approval of the Tulsa Preservation Commission.
When the residents of this district requested the implementation of an overlay, they sought the protection of the character of their neighborhood. The Tulsa Preservation Commission's disapproval of the proposal for the installation of the panels was consistent with the provisions of the Zoning Code and the Unified Design Guidelines and not only preserves the character of the residence but also the character of the district.

Respectfully submitted,

Roy Malcolm Porter, Jr., Ph.D., LEED AP
Historic Preservation Officer, City of Tulsa
TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

AMENDED
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Tuesday, January 26, 2021, 4:30 P.M.
City Hall @ One Technology Center, 175 East 2nd Street
10th Floor, South Conference Room

VIDEOCONFERENCE

INSTRUCTIONS
PARTICIPATION VIA REMOTE ACCESS
FOR
APPLICANTS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

To participate via remote access from your computer or mobile device, select this link—https://www.gotomeet.me/CityOfTulsa2/tulsa-preservation-commission-meeting-january-26—or connect by telephone with this number—+1 (571) 317-3122—and this Access Code—161-001-549.

A. Opening Matters
   1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum
   2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, December 10, 2020
   3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

B. Actionable Items
   1. HP-0239-2020 / 1540 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)
      Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: January 19, 2021
      Applicant: Andrew M. Kern
      Proposal:
      1. Installation of solar panels on roof

   2. HP-0241-2020 / 1767 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)
      Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: January 19, 2021
      Applicants: Craig And Lindsay Zietlow
      Proposal:
      1. Replacement of door on garage
3. **HP-0242-2020 / 2215 E. 17th Pl. (Yorktown)**
   Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: January 19, 2021
   Applicant: True North Homes LLC
   Proposal:
   1. Substitution of casement windows
   Work completed without an Historic Preservation Permit
   Application to amend previous approval of application
   by Tulsa Preservation Commission on February 13, 2020

4. **HP-0244-2020 / 1629 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)**
   Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: January 19, 2021
   Applicant: Tom Neal Design
   Proposals:
   1. Replacement of rail on porch
   2. Adjustment of height of gable on garage

5. **HP-0245-2020 / 1539 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)**
   Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: January 19, 2021
   Applicant: Pinnacle Home Design
   Proposal:
   1. Construction of addition

6. **HP-0248-2021 / 706 N. Denver Ave. (Brady Heights)**
   Applicant: Charles D. (Chas) Higgins
   Proposal:
   1. Adjustment of height of porch
   Application to amend previous approval of application
   by Tulsa Preservation Commission on September 22, 2020

C. Reports
   1. Chair Report
   2. Staff Report

D. New Business
   UNDER THE OPEN MEETING ACT, THIS AGENDA ITEM IS AUTHORIZED ONLY FOR MATTERS NOT KNOWN ABOUT
   OR WHICH COULD NOT HAVE BEEN REASONABLY FORESEEN PRIOR TO THE TIME OF POSTING THE AGENDA OR
   ANY REVISED AGENDA.

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items

F. Public Comment

G. Adjournment

PROJECT PLANS AND STAFF REPORTS ARE AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW IN THE TULSA PLANNING OFFICE,
INDIAN NATIONS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS, 2 WEST SECOND STREET – SUITE 800.
A. CASE ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION
   1. Installation of solar panels on roof

B. BACKGROUND
   DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 2004
   ZONED HISTORIC PRESERVATION: 1989
   NATIONAL REGISTER LISTING: GILLETTE HISTORIC DISTRICT: 1982
   CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE: NO
   PREVIOUS ACTIONS:
   COA-2002-06-13 – JUNE 13, 2002 – TPC APPROVAL
      Demolition of structure
   COA-2002-10-10 – OCTOBER 10, 2002 – TPC APPROVAL
      Construction of residence
   HP-0238-2020 – DECEMBER 10, 2020 – TPC DENIAL
      Installation of solar panels on roof

C. ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS
   1. Installation of solar panels on roof
      i. Proposed is the installation of three (3) TrinaSolar HoneyBlack Panels on the south side of the roof above the porch. The panels would be arranged linearly and would be visible from South Gillette Avenue. During the review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee, the approval of the application with the condition that the panels be installed on the roof west of the ridge was recommended. However, the applicant has requested that the application be reviewed as submitted.

SECTION A - GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES

A.1 General Requirements
A.1.1 Retain and preserve the existing historic architectural elements of your home.
A.1.2 If replacement of historic architectural elements is necessary, match the size, shape, pattern, texture, and directional orientation of the original historic elements.
A.1.3 Ensure that work is consistent with the architectural style and period details of your home.
A.1.4 Return the structure to its original historic appearance using physical or pictorial evidence, rather than conjectural designs.

A.7 Awnings, Shutters, Mailboxes, Mechanical Systems, Etc.
A.7.6 Install systems requiring exterior components, such as solar panels or devices, where they will have minimal impact, preferably at the rear of your house or yard or on an outbuilding. Install exterior components on a historic building in a manner that does not damage the historic roofing material or negatively impact the building’s historic character and is reversible. These considerations will be made on a case-by-case basis.

SECTION E - GUIDELINES FOR NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURES

E.1 General Requirements
E.1.1 For the purposes of this chapter, non-contributing structures are those listed as not contributing to the historic character of the district due to age or architectural style in the National Register Nomination for the district.
E.1.2 Non-contributing structures will be considered products of their own time. Do not attempt to create a false appearance of the predominant character and architectural style of the rest of the district.
E.1.3 Follow Section A (Rehabilitation) and Section B (Additions) as they relate to the character-defining elements of the non-contributing structure.
E.1.4 Ensure that work on non-contributing structures does not detract from or diminish the historic character of the overall district.

1540 South Gillette Avenue
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
THE SOUTH FORTY AND FIVE-TENTHS
460.0 FEET OF LOT TEN (10), AND THE NORTH
THIRTY-FOUR AND FIVE-TENTHS
45.5 FEET OF LOT ELEVEN (11), BLOCK TWO (2),
HOPPING'S ADDITION TO THE CITY OF
TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

1540 S. GILLETTE AVE
EXISTING 2-STORY RESIDENCE

EXISTING SOLAR PANELS
ON HOUSE ROOF

EXISTING 1-STORY OUTDOOR DECK
ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

EXISTING DRIVEWAY

EXISTING 2-STORY GARAGE

EXISTING SOLAR PANELS
ON GARAGE ROOF

EXISTING ELECTRICAL PANELS

EXISTING 8 FT HIGH FENCE

EXISTING 2 FT HIGH FENCE

EASEMENT

SITE PLAN
SCALE 1" = 10'0"
TYPICAL ROOFTOP SOLAR PANELS
TRINA SOLAR HONEY BLACK M
TSM-325DD06M.05 (II)
SOLAR PANEL DIMENSIONS
5'-6 1/2" x 3'-3 1/4" x 1 3/8"

NEW SOLAR PANELS ON HOUSE ROOF

HOUSE ROOF PLAN
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
DECEMBER 11, 2020
1540 SOUTH GILLETTE AVENUE (home built in 2005) – mainly an empty lot previously
ROOFTOP SOLAR PANELS – FRONT PORCH SOUTH ROOF
PHOTOS OF VIEWPOINTS FROM GILLETTE AVENUE

TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION - UNIFIED DESIGN GUIDELINES

RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES WITHIN HISTORIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICTS

SECTION A – GUIDELINES FOR REHABILITATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES

A.7 Awnings, Shutters, Mailboxes, Mechanical Systems, etc.

A.7.6 Install systems requiring exterior components, such as solar panels or devices, where they will have minimal impact . . . Install exterior components on a historic building in a manner that does not damage the historic roofing material or negatively impact the building's historic character and is reversible. These considerations will be made on a case-by-case basis.

SECTION E – GUIDELINES FOR NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURES

E.1 General Requirements

E.1.1 For the purposes of this chapter, non-contributing structures are those listed as not contributing to the historic character of the district due to age or architectural style in the National Register Nomination for the district.

E.1.2 Non-contributing structures will be considered products of their own time. Do no attempt to create false appearance of the predominant character and architectural style of the rest of the district.

PROPOSAL FOR 1540 SOUTH GILLETTE AVENUE:

Install 3 TrinaSolar HoneyBlack M TSM-DD06M.05(II) solar panels on the south side of the front porch roof out of visual sight from South Gillette Avenue or the front sidewalk:

East Elevation: Street View from S. Gillette Ave. East Elevation: Sidewalk View
Approach View from S. Gillette Ave. (VANTAGE POINT 1 – NO VISUAL IMPACT OF PANELS)

Approach View from S. Gillette Ave. (VANTAGE POINT 2 - MINIMAL VISUAL IMPACT ON SEASONAL BASIS)
Approach View from S. Gillette Ave. (VANTAGE POINT 3-NO VISUAL IMPACT OF PANELS)

Approach View from S. Gillette Ave. (VANTAGE POINT 4-NO VISUAL IMPACT OF PANELS)
1. The specified solar panels are solid black and appear similar to a skylight when configured in a rectangular pattern

2. By positioning the solar panels on the south side of the front porch roof and providing a large setback from the edge of the roof, the solar panels will have minimal impact on the street side image of the home (see Vantage Point Photos 1 to 5)

3. The installation of the mounts for the solar panels do not damage the existing roofing and are reversible in that they can be removed without impacting the roofing.
4. There are examples of awnings, skylights, and mechanical systems in the Gillette District that currently exist that are much more visible from South Gillette Avenue and South Yorktown Place than the proposed solar panels:

*Skylights visible from the street at 1525 S. Yorktown Pl. (GILLETTE DISTRICT)*
Skylights visible from the street at 1529 S. Yorktown Pl. (GILLETTE DISTRICT)

Aluminum posts and fabric awning visible from 2 streets at 1568 S. Yorktown Pl. (GILLETTE DISTRICT)
Aluminum posts & awning & satellite dish visible from street at 1514 S. Gillette Ave. (GILLETTE DISTRICT)

Aluminum posts and fabric awning visible from 2 streets at 1565 S. Gillette Ave. (GILLETTE DISTRICT)
Aluminum posts and fabric awning visible from street at 1555 S. Gillette Ave. (GILLETTE DISTRICT)

Window A/C unit visible from street at 1559 S. Gillette Ave. (GILLETTE DISTRICT)
Window A/C unit visible from street at 1522 S. Gillette Ave. (GILLETTE DISTRICT)

5. There are examples of skylights in other historical districts such as Swan Park and North Maple Ridge that currently exist that are much more visible from the street than the proposed solar panels:

Skylights visible from 2 streets at 1632 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Park)
Skylights visible from the street at 1621 S. Quaker Ave. (Swan Park)

Skylights visible from the street at 1586 Swan Drive (Swan Park)
Skylights visible from the street at 1616 S. Peoria Ave. (North Maple Ridge)
A. Opening Matters
   1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum
      Commissioner Turner called the Regular Meeting to order at 4:31 P.M.

      Members Present
      James E. Turner, AIA
      Ted A. Reeds, II, AIA
      Mark D. G. Sanders
      Matthew D. McAfee

      Staff Present
      Felicity O. Good
      Roy M. (Jed) Porter, Jr.

      Others Present
      Andrew M. Kern*, Sasha A. and Keith A. Martin*, Tom Neal, Craig Zietlow*,
      Candace M. Dillingham*, Chris Latvala*

      *Present via Remote Access

   2. Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review
      a. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
         No Conflicts of Interest were disclosed.
b. Non-Actionable Item for Preliminary Review
   **1332 E. 18th St.** (Swan Lake)
   Applicants: Sasha A. and Keith A. Martin
   Proposal:
   1. Construction of retaining wall

   Discussion:
   - Staff presented a brief report, noting the conditions on the site, which had prompted the request for a preliminary review. Concerned about the structural integrity of the wall, the applicants have consulted several engineers and have retained a landscape architect to assist with development of a solution. Among the solutions under consideration are the replacement of the wall at its present height of eight feet (8'-0") or the replacement of the wall in two sections, each four feet (4'-0") in height and constructed on terraces, with the application of stucco to the surface. Commissioner Turner inquired whether the installation of a Perma Jack System had been considered and was informed that, although its installation had been considered, contractors were concerned about the stability of the stone and mortar. Neighborhood Representative Atkins noted the similarity to conditions on the property located at 1638 East 17th Place, inquired whether the neighbors had been contacted about the possible concealment of the original wall, and wondered whether the section of the wall near the corner could be reconstructed and the mortar elsewhere repointed. Candace Melton Dillingham of skil Landscape Architecture noted that no exploration of the site behind the wall had been attempted and proposed that reconstruction of the wall in two sections would be more pedestrian-friendly. Repointing has been determined not to be feasible due to leakage, but further treatment of the site has been proposed, including partial excavation to install a French Drain with the soil behind the wall to be packed firmly. Mr. Atkins inquired whether this wall was the original wall, and the applicants mentioned the date—1970—inscribed in the stone. Mr. Atkins then encouraged contact with the neighbors to confirm whether the original wall had been concealed during construction of this wall.

   As the discussion concluded, Commissioner Turner noted that the Tulsa Preservation Commission could only respond to actual proposals, indicated that the proposal for two sections of wall arranged on terraces would be appropriate, and recommended that a native stone be applied as the veneer. Commissioner Reeds proposed the further exploration of the site to confirm whether the original wall was still present, and Commissioner Sanders speculated that the original wall was present but concealed.
c. Applications for Historic Preservation Permits

1540 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)
Applicant: Andrew M. Kern
Proposal:
1. Installation of solar panels on roof

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, noting that the applicant had revised the proposal previously disapproved by the Tulsa Preservation Commission and reduced the number of panels from six to three. Commissioner Turner acknowledged the reduction of the number of panels but expressed concern about the establishment of a precedent with even the approval of the installation of a limited number of panels. Several members of the subcommittee proposed relocation of the panels elsewhere on the roof, and Commissioner Turner proposed installation of the panels on the roof west of the ridge.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Reeds made a motion to recommend approval of the application with the condition that the panels be installed on the roof west of the ridge. The motion was seconded by Neighborhood Representative McAfee and was approved unanimously.

Vote: 1540 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1767 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)
Applicants: Craig And Lindsay Zietlow
Proposal:
1. Replacement of door on garage

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, and afterwards the applicants declined to comment. Commissioner Turner inquired whether the panels would have texture, as the illustration seemed to indicate, and the applicants responded that the surface would be smooth. Commissioner Reeds inquired about the panes and, after being informed that the glass would be clear, recommended tempered glass. The applicants commented on the appearance of the windows in the residence, indicating a desire to change the windows. Commissioner Turner invited submission of a proposal.
As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Sanders made a motion to recommend approval of the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and was approved unanimously.

Vote: 1767 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2215 E. 17th Pl. (Yorktown)
Applicant: True North Homes LLC
Proposals:
1. Substitution of casement windows
2. Removal of balcony

Work completed without an Historic Preservation Permit
Application to amend previous approval of application
by Tulsa Preservation Commission on February 13, 2020

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, noting that casement windows had been substituted for the windows previously approved in order to comply with the requirements for egress and that the balcony had not been installed, as the Owner and Contractor had determined during construction that the door, balcony, and window would not be aligned. Gant Hinkle, the representative for True North Homes LLC, reiterated that the balcony could only be aligned with the door or the window but not both. Commissioner Turner observed that the door and window appeared to be aligned on the elevation. However, Mr. Hinkle noted that, after construction, the door and window were not aligned, because the position of the door was adjusted to accommodate the placement of the mailbox, and that the installation of the balcony could only be achieved were its size to be reduced. Commissioner Reeds expressed regret at the omission of the balcony, noting its contribution to the appearance of the façade. Commissioners Reeds and Turner agreed that the substitution of the casement windows would be acceptable, but Commissioner Reeds proposed a revision of the design of the balcony and requested its representation on the elevation. Commissioner Sanders expressed his appreciation of the appearance of the residence without the balcony, commenting on its resemblance to the International Style. Neighborhood Representative Atkins commented that, with the addition of the balcony, the residence resembled several residences in the North Maple Ridge Historic Preservation Overlay District.
As there was no further discussion, the submission of a revision of the design of the balcony was recommended. Commissioner Reeds made a motion to recommend the approval of the substitution of the casement windows. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sanders and was approved by a majority.

Vote: 2215 E. 17th Pl. (Yorktown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1624 S. Victor Ave. (Yorktown)
Applicant: Tom Neal Design
Proposals:
1. Replacement of platform and steps at entry
2. Construction of enclosure for platform
3. Installation of rail
4. Replacement of door on east façade

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, noting that Product Data for the door had not been provided. Mr. Neal presented several images of doors via his mobile device and invited comments; the door with six lites was preferred. Commissioner Reeds requested Product Data for the fixture. Discussion then focused on the vocabulary of materials proposed for the enclosure. Mr. Neal indicated that the enclosure would be constructed with wood and clad in cedar shingles. Commissioner Turner proposed the construction of the enclosure with clinker brick and the application of shingles in the gable. Mr. Neal expressed concern about the availability of material and expense of construction but was assured that enough material should be available. Commissioner Turner proposed the replacement of the arch with a lintel, which would be constructed with timber, and repeated his proposal for installation of shingles in the gable.

As there was no further discussion, Mr. Neal agreed to relay comments to his client and revise the design. The period of review will be extended, and the revisions will be submitted for review by the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee during its next Regular Meeting on February 4.
1629 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)
Applicant: Tom Neal Design
Proposals:
1. Replacement of rail on porch
2. Adjustment of height of gable on garage

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, and afterwards the applicant commented on the desire for replacement of the metal rail presently on the porch and the necessity to adjust the height of the gable due to the increase in the height of the deck below the gable during construction. Commissioner Turner inquired about the projection of the roof of the garage under the shed roof and was informed that the shed roof had been removed. Neighborhood Representative McAfee requested confirmation that the garage was detached from the residence and was informed that the garage and residence were separated. Commissioner Turner requested confirmation of the location of the projection of the roof of the garage and was informed that the roof was located north of the wall of the residence. Commissioner Reeds directed attention to the proposal for the replacement of the rail and expressed approval of the design.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Sanders made a motion to recommend approval of the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and was approved unanimously.

Vote: 1629 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1539 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)
Applicant: Pinnacle Home Design
Proposal:
1. Construction of addition

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, and afterwards Keith R. Dalessandro, the representative for Pinnacle Home Design, commented that most of the addition would not be visible from the right-of-way; the south façade would be the most visible section. Commissioner Turner inquired whether the new siding would match the siding presently on the residence and was informed that the siding would match. Discussion then focused on the design of the roof and the impact of the addition on the site.
Commissioner Reeds inquired whether the slope of the roof of the addition would match the slope of the roof of the residence and was informed that the slopes would match. Commissioner Reeds then inquired about the impact of the addition on ease of access to the garage. Mr. Dalessandro noted that only one side of the garage could easily be entered after construction of the addition. Neighborhood Representative McAfee wondered whether creation of a lack of access to the garage would be acceptable, and Neighborhood Representative Atkins expressed concern about the establishment of a precedent. Mr. Dalessandro offered to provide dimensions of that section of the site. Commissioner Sanders inquired about the installation of HardiePlank Smooth Lap Siding and was informed that it would be installed only on the addition. Commissioner Sanders then inquired whether any of the windows on the residence would be altered or removed and was informed that no changes would occur. Commissioner Reeds recommended that the muntins on any new window match those on the windows presently on the residence.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Reeds made a motion to recommend approval of the application with the conditions that the applicant confirm the size of the muntins and provide a Site Plan with dimensions. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sanders and was approved unanimously.

Vote: 1539 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAfee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1521 E. 21st St. (Swan Lake)
Applicant: Jeffrey D. Bacon
Proposal:
1. Installation of fence
   Work completed without an Historic Preservation Permit

Discussion:
- Staff presented its report, and afterwards the applicant declined to comment. Commissioner Turner inquired about the transition in the heights of the fence and was informed that the height of the section of the fence near the western boundary would be reduced to four feet (4'-0") to match the height of the fence to which it will be connected.
The fence near the southern boundary is four feet (4'-0") in height and will eventually be concealed by the holly which has been planted, and the gate for the driveway will be six feet (6'-0") in height to deter any intrusion but will not be located in the street yard and will match the style of the fence elsewhere on the site. Commissioner Turner then requested additional information on the fence, including the locations and heights on the east and west sides of the site and the connections between the sections. The applicant agreed to provide this documentation, and an extension of the period of review was granted.

B. New Business
Mr. Kern joined the Regular Meeting via mobile device and requested information about the review of his application. When informed about the condition for approval, he requested that the proposal for installation of the panels be submitted for review as presented in the application and indicated his readiness to appeal an unfavorable decision to the Board of Adjustment. Staff informed him that the Board of Adjustment would only review compliance with procedure. Neighborhood Representative McAfee inquired about the mitigation of the installation of the equipment by American Electric Power in the Yorktown Historic Preservation Overlay District. Staff has contacted the Owner for a report on the status of the effort towards mitigation of the appearance of the equipment but has not received a reply. Neighborhood Representative Atkins expressed concern about the conversion of garages to Accessory Dwelling Units, and Commissioner Sanders commented that this activity could be a topic for discussion during the Annual Retreat.

C. Adjournment
Commissioner Turner adjourned the Regular Meeting at 6:51 P.M.
TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting
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Agenda

- Call to Order and Verification of Quorum
- Approval of Minutes
- Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
- Actionable Items
1540 South Gillette Avenue

Applicant: Andrew M. Kern
Proposal:
1. Installation of solar panels on roof
1540 South Gillette Avenue
1540 South Gillette Avenue
TYPICAL ROOFTOP SOLAR PANELS
TRIMAX SOLAR HONEY BLACK III
TMA-2033 96W 95 (R)
SOLAR PANEL DIMENSIONS
2-6 1/2" x 3-3 1/4" x 1 3/8"

NEW SOLAR PANELS ON HOUSE ROOF
TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, January 26, 2021, 4:30 P.M.
City Hall @ One Technology Center, 175 East 2nd Street
10th Floor - South Conference Room

A. Opening Matters
   1. Call to Order and Verification of Quorum
      Commissioner Townsend called the Regular Meeting to order at 4:37 P.M.

      Members Present
      Mary Lee Townsend, Ph.D., Chair
      James E. Turner, AIA, Vice-Chair
      Holly Becker
      Peter Grant, CGR, CAPS
      Ted A. Reeds, II, AIA
      Mark D. G. Sanders

      Members Absent
      Joy Jones, Secretary
      Chris J. Bumgarner
      Susan J. McKee, MFA
      Katelyn C. Parker, RA
      Robert L. Shears, ASLA

      Staff Present
      Audrey D. Blank¹, Roy M. (Jed) Porter, Jr., Felicity O. Good

      Others Present
      Andrew M. Kern¹, Charles D. (Chas) Higgins¹, Craig Ziettlow¹, David and Janice Connolly¹, Keith R. Dalessandro¹, Matthew D. McAfee¹, Sally H. Davies

      ¹ Participation via Remote Access
      ² Present via Remote Access but unable to participate due to the requirements of the Open Meeting Act

   2. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting, December 10, 2020
      Commissioner Reeds made a motion to approve the Minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Becker and approved unanimously.

      Vote: Minutes – Regular Meeting, December 10, 2020

      In Favor   Opposed   Abstaining   Not Present
      1. Townsend
      2. Turner
      3. Becker
      4. Grant
      5. Reeds
      6. Sanders

      Jones
      Bumgarner
      McKee
      Parker
      Shears

3.45
3. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
   No Conflicts of Interest were disclosed.

B. Actionable Items
1. HP-0239-2020 / 1540 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)
   Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: January 19, 2021
   Applicant: Andrew M. Kern
   Proposal:
   1. Installation of solar panels on roof

While staff attempted to engage the PowerPoint Presentation, the applicant explained the proposal to install three (3) solar panels on the roof—a reduction from the six (6) panels originally proposed. Staff added that, according to the applicant, the three (3) panels would be visible from the street in only one direction and not in every season. Commissioner Turner reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee found little difference in visibility between the original proposal for installation of six (6) panels and the present proposal for installation of three (3) panels. The Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee had recommended approval of the application with the condition that the panels be installed on the west side of the ridge, but the applicant had later noted that the placement of panels in that location would not be feasible. Commissioner Townsend inquired whether it was necessary for the panels to face south, and the applicant answered affirmatively, adding that the installation of the three (3) panels would allow his residence to rely completely on solar energy. Commissioner Sanders inquired about the length of ownership, and the applicant replied that the residence had been constructed for the previous owners in 2005 and that he had purchased the property in 2006. The applicant commented that, as an architect and engineer, he was sensitive to standards for historic preservation but was eager to incorporate new technology and added that, in his opinion, the installation of the panels would not adversely impact the neighborhood. Commissioner Sanders inquired about the structure previously on the site, and the applicant replied that the structure was a shed, not a residence. Commissioner Reeds inquired whether these panels could be placed at a ninety-degree (90°) angle at the ridge of the roof, and the applicant stated that any orientation on the southeast section of the roof would be acceptable. Commissioner Reeds replied that it would be an improvement but would not reduce the visibility of the panels. Commissioner Reeds then inquired whether the panels that were not visible from the street could be replaced with more efficient panels, and the applicant responded that the panels presently on the residence were already highly efficient and newly installed. Commissioner Becker announced that, although she understood other commissioners’ hesitation to allow the installation of solar panels in their proposed location, the design of solar panels has improved over time and conservation of energy was a compelling reason to allow the installation of the solar panels.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Turner made a motion to deny the application, citing Guideline A.7.6 in the Unified Design Guidelines. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and was approved by a majority. Commissioner Sanders noted that he voted in opposition to the motion because of the residence’s status as a noncontributing structure.

Vote: 1540 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Townsend</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Turner</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bumgarner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McKee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shears</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. HP-0241-2020 / 1767 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: January 19, 2021*

Applicants: Craig and Lindsay Zietlow

Proposal:
1. Replacement of door on garage

Staff presented its report, and afterwards Commissioner Turner reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee felt the applicants had made a good attempt at replication of carriage-house doors and added that the panels would have a smooth surface. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Grant, Commissioner Turner confirmed that the doors would be hinged. The applicant added that the garage would be used as a workshop. Commissioner Reeds inquired about the reason for the doors to swing inward, and the applicant replied that the length of the driveway limited the ability of the doors to swing outward.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and was approved unanimously.


Vote: 1767 S. St. Louis Ave. (Swan Lake)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Townsend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Turner</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bumgarner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Becker</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td>McKee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grant</td>
<td>Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shears</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. HP-0244-2020 / 1629 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)

*Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: January 19, 2021*

Applicant: Tom Neal Design

Proposals:
1. Replacement of rail on porch
2. Adjustment of height of gable on garage

Staff presented its report, noting that the detached garage extended into the street yard and, therefore, was subject to review by the Tulsa Preservation Commission. Commissioner Turner reported that the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee found the adjustment of the height of the gable on the garage to be minimally intrusive and the porch to be compatible with the style of the residence and other porches.
in the neighborhood. Commissioner Townsend commented on the apparent connection between the gable and the roof of the residence, but Commissioner Sanders clarified the presentation in the elevation, noting that the gable on the garage would not be connected to the residence.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Sanders made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grant and was approved unanimously.


Vote: 1629 S. Trenton Ave. (Swan Lake)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Townsend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Vote: 1539 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Townsend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4. HP-0245-2020 / 1539 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)

Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee Review Date: January 19, 2021
Applicant: Pinnacle Home Design
Proposal:
1. Construction of addition

Staff presented its report, noting that a Site Plan had been provided at the request of the Historic Preservation Permit Subcommittee. Commissioner Turner reported that the addition would be barely visible from the street, and Commissioner Reeds added that the addition would have a minimal impact on the residence and neighborhood. Commissioner Turner recalled the discussion of the distance between the addition and the detached garage but noted that the owner's ability to access the garage should not be part of the Tulsa Preservation Commission's review of the proposal.

As there was no further discussion, Commissioner Grant made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Reeds and was approved unanimously.


Vote: 1539 S. Gillette Ave. (Gillette)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Townsend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **HP-0248-2021 / 706 N. Denver Ave. (Brady Heights)**

Applicant: Charles D. (Chas) Higgins

Proposal:
1. Adjustment of height of porch

*Application to amend previous approval of application by Tulsa Preservation Commission on September 22, 2020*

Staff presented its report, sharing photographs showing the construction of the residence in progress. The applicant added that the topography on the site spurred the adjustment of the height of the porch. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Grant, the applicant stated that the front door was originally four inches (0'-4") above the porch and that the porch would not have been approximately five feet (5'-0") above grade. Staff inquired about the height of the porch compared to that of the residence to the south, and the applicant replied that they would be similar in height. Commissioner Turner observed that the porch would be higher than that of the adjacent residence, and Commissioner Reeds stated the porch ceiling would be lower. Upon an inquiry from Commissioner Turner, the applicant confirmed that the entire residence would be higher. Commissioner Sanders inquired whether the roof of the porch could match that of the residence to the south, and the applicant replied that the height would be similar but observed that the height of the front door and floor of the balcony would limit the flexibility in the adjustment of the height of the roof over the porch. Commissioner Grant noted that the height of the stem wall had dramatically changed as a result of the adjustments and should have also been reviewed by the Tulsa Preservation Commission.

As there was no discussion, Commissioner Reeds made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the applicant attempt to match the height of the porch ceiling on the residence to the south. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and was approved unanimously.


**Vote:** 706 N. Denver Ave. (Brady Heights)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Townsend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bumgarner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Becker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McKee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Reports
1. Chair Report
   Commissioner Townsend announced appointments to committees for the 2021 Calendar Year:
Historic Preservation Committee: James E. Turner (Chair), Holly Becker, Joy Jones, Susan J. McKee, Katelyn C. Parker, Mark D. G. Sanders, Chris J. Bumgarner (Alternate), Ted A. Reeds (Alternate), Robert L. Shears (Alternate)

Outreach Committee: Susan J. McKee (Chair), Holly Becker, Chris J. Bumgarner, Ted A. Reeds, James E. Turner

Rules and Regulations Committee: Katelyn C. Parker (Chair), Mark D. G. Sanders, Joy Jones, Robert L. Shears

Ad Hoc Committee on Process: Peter Grant (Chair), Chris J. Bumgarner, Joy Jones, Katelyn C. Parker

2. Staff Report
Staff reported on work in progress at The Joinery located at 640 North Denver Avenue. Commissioner Reeds inquired about the material of the facade and was informed that masonry has been used. Staff also reported on completion of Work at 739 North Cheyenne Avenue.

Staff proposed that events scheduled for the 2020-21 Fiscal Year, such as the Historic Homeowners Fair and a workshop on the treatment of wooden windows, be cancelled due to the threat posed by COVID-19 and that the Tulsa Preservation Commission consider using the funds allocated for contractual services to secure a consultant for a new survey of the Morningside Addition in the Maple Ridge Historic Residential District. The survey would be the first phase in the revision of the nomination of the Maple Ridge Historic Residential District, which did not identify every residence that could be considered a Contributing Resource. After discussion, the members of the Tulsa Preservation Commission and Neighborhood Representative Davies endorsed the proposal.

D. New Business None

E. Announcements and Future Agenda Items None

F. Public Comment None

G. Adjournment Commissioner Townsend adjourned the Regular Meeting at 5:39 P.M.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION PERMIT DENIAL

An Historic Preservation Permit has been denied by the Tulsa Preservation Commission for work described below under the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Tulsa (Section 70.070) to Andrew M. Kern for the address of 1540 South Gillette Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, located in the Gillette Historic Preservation Overlay District.

DENIED PROPOSAL

Installation of solar panels on roof

Performance of any Work described under the Denied Proposal is a violation of the Zoning Ordinance and may result in the revocation of building permits and/or code enforcement.

Roy Malcolm Porter, Jr.
Historic Preservation Officer, City of Tulsa

Date issued: January 26, 2021
Number: HP-0239-2020
HISTORIC PRESERVATION PERMIT DENIAL

An Historic Preservation Permit has been **denied** by the Tulsa Preservation Commission for work described below under the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Tulsa (Section 70.070) to Andrew M. Kern for the address of 1540 South Gillette Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, located in the Gillette Historic Preservation Overlay District.

**DENIED PROPOSAL**

Installation of solar panels on roof

Performance of any Work described under the Denied Proposal is a violation of the Zoning Ordinance and may result in the revocation of building permits and/or code enforcement.

Roy Malcolm Porter, Jr.
Roy Malcolm Porter, Jr.
Historic Preservation Officer, City of Tulsa

Date issued: December 10, 2020
Number: HP-0238-2020
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
THE SOUTH FORTY AND FIVE TENTHS THIRTY-FOUR AND FIVE TENTHS OF LOT ELEVEN (11), BLOCK TWO (2), HOPKINS' ADDITION TO THE CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA.

1540 S. GILLETTE AVE. EXISTING 2-STORY RESIDENCE

EXISTING 2-STORY OUTDOOR DECK ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

EXISTING SOLAR PANELS ON HOUSE ROOF

EXISTING DRIVEWAY

EXISTING 2-STORY GARAGE

EXISTING SOLAR PANELS ON GARAGE ROOF

EXISTING ELECTRICAL PANELS

EXISTING 6 FT HIGH FENCE

EXISTING ELECTRICAL EASEMENT

HIGH FENCE

SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1" = 10'-0"
TYPICAL ROOFTOP SOLAR PANELS
TRINA SOLAR HONEY BLACK M
TSM-325DD06M.05 (II)
SOLAR PANEL DIMENSIONS
5'-6 1/2" x 3'-3 1/4" x 1 3/8"

NEW SOLAR PANELS ON HOUSE ROOF

HOUSE ROOF PLAN
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

NOVEMBER 9, 2020
BOA-23086

Subject Tract
19-13 07

Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.
Aerial Photo Date: February 2018
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