



# TULSA PRESERVATION COMMISSION

## SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

**Thursday, March 25, 2010, 11:00 a.m.**  
City Hall @ One Technology Center, 175 E. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
10<sup>th</sup> Floor South Conference Room

THE AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING WAS POSTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE TULSA CITY CLERK, 175 EAST SECOND ST., TULSA OKLAHOMA, IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN MEETING ACT ON MARCH 23, 2010 AT 9:46 AM.

**1. Roll Call** – Chairman Sober called the Special Meeting to order at 11:01 a.m.

**Members Present**

Bob Sober, Chair  
Matt King, Vice-Chair  
Kristen Bergman, Secretary  
Pamela Curtis  
Charles Gilmore  
Susan McKee  
Anne Pollard\*  
Robert Shears  
Barbara Smallwood

**Members Absent**

Mary Lee Townsend  
Elizabeth Wright  
Jack Hodgson  
Jim Turner  
Bob Winchester  
Paula Wood

**Staff Present**

Patrick Boulden, Amanda DeCort, Ed Sharrer

\* Arrived late

**2. Staff Approvals**

Commissioners discussed an amendment to the historic preservation Ordinance (Chapter 10A of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code) to allow for expanded staff approval authority. Suggestions were made on how restrictive or permissive the staff approval language should be. The phrase “as authorized by the Preservation Commission” was added to the proposed language to give the Commission more flexibility, so that they may grant staff permission to administratively approve additional items as appropriate.

A second item pertaining to a potential trial period was discussed and the Commission decided that the annual retreat would be a good time to evaluate how well the new staff approval system is working.

Staff approval authority is prescribed by the Ordinance, so revisions must be forwarded to the TMAPC and City Council for public hearings and approval before changes will take effect.

The following language was voted on and approved by members present:

- A. “Approval of COA by Preservation Commission Staff: Preservation Staff may issue a COA when the proposed work is of a rehabilitative nature on an existing structure, involving the replacement of existing materials with like materials, and such work complies with the design guidelines for the district. Additionally, Preservation Staff may issue a COA for minor exterior alterations as authorized by the Preservation Commission, provided such work complies with the design guidelines for the district. Minor exterior alterations shall include:
1. Installation of storm windows and doors
  2. Removal of non-historic materials including, but not limited to, siding, storm windows and doors, awnings, shutters, retaining walls and fences; and removal of paint from historic masonry surfaces.”

Commissioner Smallwood made a motion to approve the language as stated above. Commissioner Curtis seconded. Chairman Sober called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

**In Favor**

1. Bergman
2. Curtis
3. Gilmore
4. King
5. McKee
6. Pollard
7. Shears
8. Smallwood
9. Sober

**Opposed**

None

**Abstaining**

None

**Not Present**

None

**3. Appointments & Requirements to Serve on the Commission**

The configuration of the Commission is prescribed by the Ordinance, so revisions must be forwarded to the TMAPC and City Council for public hearings and approval before changes will take effect. All items approved by the Commission under Agenda Item #3 are subject to this process.

**A. Membership Configurations**

Reducing the size of the Commission to either 9 or 11 members, for greater efficiency of operation and a more consistent experience for COA applicants, was discussed.

Commissioners debated various potential configurations of the Commission, and decided that 5 professional members, 5 historic property owners, and 1 ex-officio member would be a fair balance between professional and property owner members.

Membership would be as follows:

1. Architect
2. Landscape Architect
3. Builder/Developer
4. Realtor
5. Historian or Architectural Historian
6. Ex-Officio: Arts Commissioner
7. Historic Property Owner
8. Historic Property Owner
9. Historic Property Owner
10. Historic Property Owner
11. Historic Property Owner

Commissioner Smallwood made a motion to approve the configuration as stated above. Commissioner Pollard seconded. Chairman Sober called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

**In Favor**

1. Bergman
2. Curtis
3. Gilmore
4. King
5. McKee
6. Pollard
7. Shears
8. Smallwood
9. Sober

**Opposed**

None

**Abstaining**

None

**Not Present**

None

**B. Residency**

Commissioners discussed changing “Community Group Residents” to “Historic Property Owners” and clarifying the requirements to serve. It was agreed upon that at least three of the five Historic Property Owners must reside in their historic property or historic district. This would allow for commercial property owners to serve on the Commission, but require that the majority of the Historic Property Owners would be neighborhood residents.

The updated language would also clarify that the historic property or district must be listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places according to the updated Historic Preservation Resource Guide and agreed upon by the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office. This differs from the current language which allows potentially eligible neighborhoods without an official determination of eligibility.

The language voted on by the Commission is as follows:

“Historic Property Owners appointed to serve on the Preservation Commission must own an individually National Register-listed property or a property within a National Register listed or eligible historic district. For a district to be considered eligible, it must be identified as eligible for National Register listing in the *2010 Tulsa Historic Preservation Resource Guide* (or as amended) and agreed upon by the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office. At least three of the five Historic Property Owners must reside in their historic property or neighborhood.”

Commissioner Smallwood made a motion to approve the language as stated above. Commissioner Curtis seconded. Chairman Sober called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Bergman	None	None	None
2. Curtis			
3. Gilmore			
4. King			
5. McKee			
6. Pollard			
7. Shears			
8. Smallwood			
9. Sober			

### **C. Demonstrated Interest**

In keeping with the City of Tulsa’s agreement with the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office, persons appointed to serve on the Tulsa Preservation Commission must have a demonstrated interest in historic preservation. The Commission discussed adding language to this effect to the Ordinance, to provide the Mayor and Council with additional guidance and clarification for appointments.

The language voted on by the Commission is as follows:

“Appointees to the Tulsa Preservation Commission must have a demonstrated interest in historic preservation, as required by the Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office, to maintain Certified Local Government status with the National Park Service.”

Commissioner Smallwood made a motion to approve the proposed language as stated above. Commissioner McKee seconded. Chairman Sober called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Bergman	None	None	None
2. Curtis			
3. Gilmore			
4. King			
5. McKee			
6. Pollard			
7. Shears			
8. Smallwood			
9. Sober			

#### **D. Term Limits**

Language requiring term limits for Commissioners was proposed for addition to the Ordinance, in order to allow new people the opportunity to serve without compromising institutional memory. The Commission decided that staff Attorney Patrick Boulden should reword the proposed language for clarity. The concept approved by the Commission is as follows, though the wording is expected to change slightly:

“Commissioners may serve no more than three sequential terms; after three terms, the Commissioner must rotate off the Commission for one calendar year. Term Limits are to begin when the ordinance amendment goes into effect; they are not retroactive.”

Commissioner Smallwood made a motion to approve the term limits. Commissioner Gilmore seconded. Chairman Sober called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Bergman	None	None	None
2. Curtis			
3. Gilmore			
4. King			
5. McKee			
6. Pollard			
7. Shears			
8. Smallwood			
9. Sober			

#### **E. Phasing of Changes**

The Commission discussed how the proposed changes could be phased in. Staff will come up with a potential schedule. This item did not require a vote. Staff attorney Boulden noted that the language for quorum requirements must also be updated in the Ordinance concurrently to changes to the makeup of the Commission.

### **4. Meeting Dates, Times, & Structure**

#### **A. Potential Schedule**

The Commission discussed changing to a twice-monthly meeting format. The proposed schedule calls for TPC meetings on 11:00am on the second Thursday of each month, and 4:30pm on the fourth Tuesday of each month.

Concerns were raised about how this would affect the COA subcommittee schedule. The group decided that the COA subcommittee should meet one week prior to each regularly scheduled TPC meeting, at the same time of day as the TPC meeting. Therefore, the first COA meeting of the month would be held on the first Thursday of the month at 11:00 a.m., and the second COA subcommittee meeting on the third Tuesday at 4:30 p.m. The COA subcommittee meeting schedule was further discussed and voted on under Agenda Item 5, below.

Commissioner Smallwood made a motion to approve the twice-monthly TPC meeting schedule as detailed above. Commissioner King seconded. Chairman Sober called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Bergman	None	None	None
2. Curtis			
3. Gilmore			
4. King			
5. McKee			
6. Pollard			
7. Shears			
8. Smallwood			
9. Sober			

#### **B. Transition Schedule**

Commissioner Smallwood noted that transitioning to the new meeting schedule would take several months, and asked staff to present a new meeting schedule and transition schedule at the April 8<sup>th</sup> TPC meeting. She noted that changing the meeting schedule does not require changing the Ordinance. No action was needed on this agenda item.

### **5. Change of Scope for COA Subcommittee**

#### **A. Proposal to Focus COA Subcommittee on New Construction**

The implementation committee proposed changing the scope of the COA subcommittee to focus COA subcommittee review on new construction and significant additions. All other applications would be approved by staff or sent directly to the TPC under the new twice-monthly TPC meeting schedule.

#### **B. Purpose**

The Committee discussed how changes to COA subcommittee would expedite processing applications and make the COA process easier for citizens. Commissioners acknowledged the necessity of the current COA process for new construction projects, but noted that multiple reviews are usually unnecessary for less complicated projects.

**C. Structure**

The membership structure and leadership of the subcommittee would remain unchanged.

Because the TPC meeting dates and times will change, it was proposed that the COA subcommittee move its meeting dates and times to coordinate effectively. As discussed in Agenda Item 4A, the first COA meeting of the month would be held on the first Thursday of the month at 11:00 a.m., and the second COA subcommittee meeting on the third Tuesday at 4:30 p.m.

Commissioner Smallwood made a motion to approve the twice-monthly COA subcommittee meeting schedule as detailed above. Commissioner Pollard seconded. Chairman Sober called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously.

<u>In Favor</u>	<u>Opposed</u>	<u>Abstaining</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
1. Bergman	None	None	None
2. Curtis			
3. Gilmore			
4. King			
5. McKee			
6. Pollard			
7. Shears			
8. Smallwood			
9. Sober			

**D. Review Requirements**

The Commission debated whether or not the applicant should have the ability to request COA subcommittee review for proposals other than new construction and additions. Commissioners decided that the COA subcommittee would *only* hear proposals for new construction projects and significant additions.

Commissioner Smallwood made a motion to approve the change to the COA subcommittee scope of review as detailed above. Commissioner McKee seconded. Chairman Sober called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously.



**In Favor**

1. Bergman
2. Curtis
3. Gilmore
4. King
5. McKee
6. Pollard
7. Shears
8. Smallwood
9. Sober

**Opposed**

None

**Abstaining**

None

**Not Present**

None

**6. Adjournment**

Chairman Sober adjourned the meeting at 1:28 pm.

The proceedings of the Tulsa Preservation Commission Special Meeting of March 25, 2010 were recorded. The meeting minutes were transcribed by Amanda DeCort. Minutes were approved by the TPC on April 8, 2010.