



**CITY OF NORMAN, OK**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING**  
Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069  
Monday, March 02, 2026 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 Municipal Building, on Monday, March 02, 2026 at 5:30 PM and notice of the agenda of the meeting was posted at the Norman Municipal Building at 201 West Gray, and on the City website at least 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

### ROLL CALL

#### PRESENT

Commissioner Michael Zorba  
Commissioner Jo Ann Dysart  
Commissioner Karen Thurston  
Commissioner Kendel Posey  
Commissioner Susan Skapik  
Commissioner Tyler Burns

#### ABSENT

Commissioner Mitch Baroff  
Commissioner Kayla Molina

#### STAFF PRESENT

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer  
Jeanne Snider, Assistant City Attorney III  
Bailey LaChance, Admin Tech IV

#### GUESTS PRESENT

Marcia Hoos Reinke, 452 S Lahoma Ave, Norman, OK  
Jerrold Geiger 2220 E St, Hwy 9, Norman, OK  
Lee Hall, 648 S Lahoma Ave, Norman, OK  
Ryan Rachal, 824 Cruce St, Norman, OK

### MINUTES

1. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE MINUTES AS FOLLOWS:

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 2026.

**Motion** made by Commissioner Dysart, **Seconded** by Commissioner Thurston.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns

**January 5, 2026 Historic District Meeting Minutes were approved.**

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUESTS**

2. (HD 26-01) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED 533 S. LAHOMA AVENUE, FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: A) INSTALLATION OF A DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT; B) INSTALLATION OF A PARKING PAD IN THE REAR YARD. (This item was postponed from the February 2, 2026, meeting.)

Commissioner Tyler Burns recused himself due to a conflict of interest as the applicant for this Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) request.

**Motion** made by Commissioner Dysart to approve HD 26-01 item A) Installation of detached accessory dwelling unit, as submitted; **Seconded** by Commissioner Thurston.

Staff Report

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the staff report.

Applicant Presentation

Ryan Rachal, the applicant's project manager, presented the proposed project.

Commissioner Thurston sought clarification on whether the fence blocks the view of the ADU from the street and how much fencing currently exists around the property. Mr. Rachal confirmed the fence blocks the view of the ADU from the street and stated the entire property is fenced, though the rear fence will be modified to accommodate the new structure.

Commissioner Zorba asked for clarification on the maximum height of the proposed ADU. Mr. Rachal confirmed the ADU will be shorter than the two-story structure located in front of it.

Commissioner Skapik sought clarification on the location of the ADU and the required setbacks. Mr. Rachal stated the ADU will be similarly located as the ADU on the parcel immediately south of this property.

Public Comments

There were no public comments

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Zorba stated he believed the ADU met the Guidelines and did not see any issues at this time but sought clarification on the size of the Hardie Siding and whether it would match the existing structure. Mr. Rachal replied that the existing structure has approximately a four- or five-inch lap siding.

Commissioner Skapik stated she would like to see the Hardie Board on the new ADU match the size used on the existing structure. She then sought clarification on the size of the ADU.

Commissioner Zorba stated the height was around 14 feet. Commissioner Thurston expressed concern about the height, stating that if the drawing was to scale, it appeared the structure could be taller than 14 feet.

Commissioner Zorba agreed, noting the drawing appeared to show four-to-five-inch Hardie Siding, which would place the structure around 14 feet, but if wider siding was proposed then, structure could be taller.

Commissioner Thurston noted the plans show a significant amount of space between the primary residence and the proposed ADU and expressed concern that if the structure is too tall it may be visible from the street.

Commissioner Zorba stated the structure appeared to be less than two stories and therefore should not be visible from the street, but he would like confirmation of the exact height from the applicant's representative. He then asked whether the applicant would be willing to match the size of the Hardie Board to the primary structure.

Mr. Rachal stated that should not be a problem. He also confirmed the height was left off the drawing but stated the structure will be 14 feet tall.

Commissioner Thurston asked whether there was only one door entryway into the structure. Mr. Rachal stated there are two doors, one providing access to the ADU and the other serving as a maintenance door for the water heater.

**Motion** by Commissioner Dysart to amend the original motion to add matching the Hardie Board siding size on the ADU to the existing structure within an inch width; **Seconded** by Commissioner Thurston.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik

Voting Abstaining: Commissioner Burns

**The motion to amend HD 26-01 item A was approved.**

**Motion** by Commissioner Dysart to approve HD 26-01 item A as amended; **Seconded** by Commissioner Thurston

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik

Voting Abstaining: Commissioner Burns

**The motion for HD 26-01 item A was approved.**

**Motion** made by Commissioner Dysart to approve HD 26-01 item B) Installation of parking pad in rear yard, as submitted; **seconded** by Commissioner Thurston.

Staff Report

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Dysart sought clarification on whether the parking was for just the ADU or both the ADU and the existing structure. Ms. Starr stated the proposed use was parking for both the ADU and existing structure.

### Applicant Presentation

Ryan Rachal, the applicant's project manager, presented the proposed project.

Mr. Rachal addressed Commissioner Dysart's question and confirmed the planned use of the proposed paving is to relieve congestion in the front driveway.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether the existing driveway will remain. Mr. Rachal confirmed it will remain, noting the additional paving in the rear is intended to provide extra parking due to the limited size of the driveway.

Ms. Starr added that the zoning ordinance states new paving cannot be added to the existing driveway until the maximum allowable paving has been utilized off the alleyway.

### Public Comments

No public comments

### Commission Discussion

Commissioner Thurston stated she was concerned about the size of the proposed concrete slab off the alleyway, noting it is much wider than the proposed ADU structure. Commissioner Skapik agreed.

Commissioner Zorba acknowledged the reasoning and asked staff if the proposal meets the 65% requirement. Ms. Starr confirmed it does.

Commissioner Skapik expressed concern about congestion in the alleyway, as the proposal includes five new parking spaces. Ms. Starr noted that typical rear-yard parking pad request is for 400 sq. ft., and she further stated she could not remember any recent requests for a parking pad with more than 440 sq. ft.

Commissioner Zorba asked for the square footage of the proposed pad. Ms. Starr stated it is approximately 850 sq. ft. Commissioner Thurston noted the existing gravel pad in the back and stated the proposed size feels excessive.

Ms. Starr requested feedback from other Commissioners to allow the applicant the option to postpone or withdraw. Commissioner Zorba suggested reducing the number of spaces to four and shared an aerial view to illustrate the available area.

Lee Hall, 648 S Lahoma Ave, stated that a 550 sq. ft. ADU to the south has a gravel parking space in front of it, located off the alleyway, which is approximately one car width, helping confirm the scale of the proposed pad.

Commissioner Dysart stated the proposal does not violate Guidelines but agreed with reducing the number of spaces to four.

Commissioner Thurston expressed concern that five concrete parking spaces would significantly alter the landscaping and asked how many cars fit in the existing driveway. Mr. Rachal stated approximately three cars and noted the house has a 2,000 sq. ft. footprint.

Commissioner Zorba asked if cars could be ticketed for parking on non-approved parking surfaces. Ms. Starr confirmed that was correct. He noted that a parking pad could help residents find appropriate parking on the property.

Commissioner Skapik stated she leaned toward Commissioner Thurston's concern, noting that five parking spaces seem excessive.

Commissioner Thurston asked about the number of bedrooms in the structure. Mr. Rachal stated there were four bedrooms. She noted that with three cars in the front driveway and five in the rear, there could be space for eight to nine cars, which feels excessive for the area.

Ms. Starr asked if the applicant would be willing to reduce the number of parking spaces to three or four. Mr. Rachal confirmed four parking spaces would be acceptable.

Commissioner Zorba agreed with four spaces.

Commissioner Thurston maintained that four parking spaces still feel excessive and not historically appropriate.

Commissioner Posey noted that there are already two parking spaces in the back, so adding two more for a total of four would help reduce front-yard parking without a major impact on the property.

Commissioner Zorba confirmed the applicant agreed to amend the motion, reducing the parking pad to 680 sq. ft. to accommodate only four spaces. Mr. Rachal confirmed.

**Motion** by Commissioner Dysart to amend the COA request to a 680 sq. ft. parking pad to accommodate only 4 parking spaces; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik

Voting Abstaining: Commissioner Burns

**The motion to amend HD 26-01 item B was approved.**

**Motion** by Commissioner Posey to approve HD 26-01 item B) installation of a parking pad in the rear as amended to 680 sq. ft. to accommodate only four parking spaces; **Seconded** by Commissioner Dysart.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Posey,

Voting Against: Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Skapik

Voting Abstaining: Commissioner Burns

**The motion for HD 26-01 item B was approved as amended.**

3. **(HD 26-03)** CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 452 S. LAHOMA AVENUE FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION: A) REPLACEMENT OF 21 NON-ORIGINAL METAL WINDOWS ON THE SECOND STORY OF THE PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE.

**Commissioner Burns rejoined the Commission.**

**Motion** made by Commissioner Skapik to approve HD 26-03, replacement of 21 non-original metal windows on the second story of the principal structure, as submitted; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

#### Staff Report

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Zorba sought clarification on if this proposal was for just the second story windows. Ms. Starr confirmed.

#### Applicant Presentation

Marcia Hoos-Reinke, the applicant, presented the proposed project.

Commissioner Skapik sought clarification on whether the interior woodwork was rebuilt when the windows were last replaced. Ms. Hoos-Reinke stated the replacement occurred approximately 20–30 years ago and assumed the interior work was done at that time, noting the windows are not original.

Commissioner Zorba asked about photos of the proposed window product. Ms. Starr stated the images were included in the meeting agenda packet.

Commissioner Burns asked whether the photo of the window corner shown was from the upstairs or downstairs window. Ms. Hoos-Reinke confirmed it was from the downstairs window and noted that all windows in the house are the same.

Ms. Starr asked for confirmation if the window replacements would still be completed in phases. Ms. Hoos-Reinke confirmed.

Commissioner Posey asked whether screens or storm windows would be used. Ms. Hoos-Reinke stated that screens will be used.

Commissioner Thurston noted the packet states the windows are wood, but the photo makes them appear otherwise. Ms. Starr clarified that the information was pulled from the 2004 Historic Survey, which may not always reflect the current condition of the structure.

Commissioner Thurston asked for confirmation that the windows are metal rather than wood. Ms. Starr confirmed.

Commissioner Burns asked if the replacement window sashes and the trim would remain white as they are currently painted. Ms. Hoos-Reinke confirmed.

## Public Comments

There were no public comments

## Commission Discussion

Commissioner Thurston stated the proposed window replacement appears to be a like-for-like replacement, noting the existing windows are not historically accurate but have not been for some time.

Commissioner Skapik stated that restoring the windows to wood would be ideal but acknowledged that doing so may not be feasible.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns

**HD 26-03 was approved.**

4. (HD 26-04) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 720 S. LAHOMA AVENUE FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS TO THE PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE: A) REPLACEMENT OF WINDOWS; B) REPLACEMENT OF EXTERIOR DOORS; C) REPLACEMENT OF EXTERIOR SIDING, SOFFIT, AND TRIM; D) ENCLOSURE OF THE REAR PATIO TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL LIVING SPACE.

**Motion** made by Commissioner Dysart to approve HD 26-04 item A) Replacement of windows, as submitted; **Seconded** by Commissioner Burns.

## Staff Presentation

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Burns asked for clarification regarding the previous Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) issued for the property and whether the current request was an addition to that COA or a new request. Ms. Starr clarified the previous COA expired because the approved work was never initiated.

Commissioner Zorba asked for clarification on the type of windows being requested. Ms. Starr stated there are two different window types proposed for replacement of the throughout the project and deferred to the applicant's representative to explain their locations.

Commissioner Zorba also asked for clarification of the material of the clerestory windows. Ms. Starr stated the applicant informed her the clerestory windows are pieces of glass with no frame, set directly into the opening, and are inoperable.

Commissioner Burns asked how many clerestory windows there are. Ms. Starr stated there are approximately eight or nine. The applicant representative could clarify.

Commissioner Dysart asked why replacement windows are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Starr explained the Guidelines allow flexibility because replacing metal casement windows with historically appropriate options can be difficult. For this

reason, the Guidelines allow the Commission to evaluate casement window replacement on a individually to determine compatibility with the house and the surrounding historic neighborhood.

### Applicant Presentation

Jarrod Geiger, the applicant's representative, presented the proposed project.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether the Black Badge windows will be operable and if they will have the same number of lights. Mr. Geiger confirmed they will be operable. Commissioner Zorba also asked whether the windows shown in black on the submitted drawings are aluminum and if they will be operable. Mr. Geiger stated those windows will be crank style.

Commissioner Burns asked whether the applicant's representative had a clearer image of what the proposed aluminum windows. Ms. Starr stated the quote shown in the PowerPoint presentation was the only information staff received regarding the windows.

Commissioner Dysart asked whether all replacement windows will be the same size as the existing windows. Mr. Geiger confirmed they will be.

Commissioner Skapik noted that the windows shown in the Black Badge catalog appear different from the layout of the existing windows. Ms. Starr clarified that the window shown in the PowerPoint represents the design of the custom windows to be installed.

Commissioner Skapik sought clarification on whether the company will custom fabricate the windows to match the existing dimensions. Mr. Geiger confirmed they will.

Commissioner Thurston noted the windows on the south elevation appear visible from the street and expressed concern that the applicant's representative described them as not visible. Mr. Geiger stated he believes they are not visible due to foliage and trees blocking the view.

Commissioner Thurston expressed concern that the proposal replaces some windows like-for-like where visible from the street while using aluminum windows elsewhere on the house, which could alter the style and appearance of the structure.

Commissioner Burns asked what room is located on the southeast corner of the structure. Mr. Geiger stated there are two bedrooms at the front of the house.

Commissioner Thurston noted the replacement window specification sheets do not appear to the same dimensions as the current windows on the front and side of the house. Mr. Geiger stated the replacement window request for the front and sides will not match the existing windows exactly in that area. Commissioner Thurston then asked which windows the applicant is proposing for that area. Mr. Geiger stated the proposed replacements are the Twinsulator windows. Commissioner Thurston asked for clarification on the specific design from that product line. Mr. Geiger stated he was unsure which design the applicant intended to use. Ms. Starr added that the

information submitted by the applicant does not specify which window configuration will replace each existing window.

Commissioner Zorba stated the Commission needs more specific information from the applicant to decide on the request, as the specification sheet shows multiple window types without identifying where each would be installed.

Commissioner Burns agreed and stated it would be easier to evaluate the request if the same windows were proposed for the entire house.

Commissioner Thurston agreed that additional information is needed.

Mr. Geiger asked for clarification on whether sliding windows would be acceptable or if the Commission would have concerns.

Ms. Starr suggested the Commission provide feedback that Mr. Geiger could relay to the applicant.

### Public Comments

Lee Hall, 648 S Lahoma, stated her opposition to changing the window configuration on the front or side of the house.

### **\*5-minute break\***

Mr. Geiger stated he talked with the applicant during break and confirmed the side windows would be four individual panes of glass.

### Commission Discussion

Commissioner Zorba stated it would be helpful for the applicant to provide a labeled elevation drawing or other labeled document identifying the location of the proposed windows. He also expressed concern with the proposed windows on the south elevation, noting that landscaping should be considered temporary and that if the foliage were removed it would expose that side of the house. He stated he would prefer that side also be replaced with custom Black Badge windows if replacement is necessary. Commissioner Zorba also requested clarification on the condition of the existing windows. Mr. Geiger stated the windows are currently screwed shut because they are inoperable. Commissioner Zorba noted that additional documentation of the window condition would be helpful for the Commission's review.

Commissioner Thurston stated it would be helpful to know whether the windows were originally installed as non-operable or if they were once operable but have since deteriorated.

Commissioner Skapik expressed concern that the windows are a defining feature of the house and that replacements could significantly alter its appearance. She emphasized the value of preserving original windows when possible, noting that restoration can improve curb appeal and maintain the home's value. She referenced 627 Okmulgee as an example of a home where window restoration, with similar windows to the windows in this home, had been successful.

Commissioner Burns agreed that additional information is needed regarding the location of the proposed windows and stated he supports restoring the existing windows where possible. He also requested additional information and images of the clerestory windows to better understand their current condition and the proposed replacements.

Mr. Geiger asked for postponement of item A.

**Motion** by Commissioner Thurston to postpone HD 26-04 item A to undetermined date; **Seconded** by Commissioner Skapik.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns

**HD 26-04 item A was postponed.**

**Motion** made by Commissioner Skapik to approve HD 26-04 item B) Replacement of exterior doors, as submitted; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

#### Staff Presentation

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Zorba sought clarification on the location of the proposed doors. Ms. Starr stated Option A is for replacement with all Black Badge glass doors, while Option B includes Black Badge glass doors for the rear elevations while the front door would be the mahogany door as the submitted specification sheet shows.

#### Applicant Presentation

Jarrod Geiger, the applicant's representative, presented the proposed project.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether specifications were available for the Option A Black Badge glass doors.

Commissioner Burns stated he preferred the mahogany door shown in Option B but noted the Commission would need more detailed information on the other proposed doors.

#### Public Comments

No public comments

#### Commission Discussion

Commissioner Zorba stated the request presents a similar issue to the window discussion, noting the Commission needs more detailed information in order to make a decision.

Mr. Geiger stated the applicant informed him the door is shown on page 68 of the agenda packet and is from the Black Badge catalog.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether the dividers are between the panes of glass or applied to the front or back of the glass. Mr. Geiger stated he was unsure but noted the applicant indicated the door shown has six panes that could be modified to different sizes.

Commissioner Posey commented that the doors appear more modern in style.

Commissioner Thurston stated the commission must follow the Guidelines to ensure replacement features remain compatible with the historic neighborhood.

Commissioner Zorba read from the Guidelines stating doors may be replaced with a wood door of an appropriate design for the house and the historic district.

Commissioner Posey stated the Option B door appears to meet that guideline.

Commissioner Burns asked for clarification on the location of the other proposed doors on the house. Mr. Geiger pointed out their locations on the presentation slides.

Commissioner Zorba stated he would be comfortable with Option B, which includes the mahogany front door and Black Badge glass doors for the remaining doors.

**Motion** by Commissioner Dysart to amend to approve option B; **Seconded** by Commissioner Skapik.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns

**Motion** by Commissioner Burns to approve as amended to Option B; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns

**HD 26-04 item B was approved as amended.**

**Motion** by Commissioner Burns to approve HD 26-04 item C) replacement of exterior siding, soffit, and trim as presented; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

#### Staff Presentation

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the staff report

Commissioner Thurston asked about the current siding exposure. Ms. Starr stated the existing lap siding is approximately nine-inch width.

Commissioner Zorba asked if staff knew whether the proposed material would be cedar or unfinished wood. Ms. Starr stated the attached specification sheet was the only information provided.

Commissioner Burns asked whether a specification sheet for the soffit was included. Ms. Starr stated none had been submitted.

#### Applicant Presentation

Jarrold Geiger, applicant representative, presented the proposed project.

Commissioner Zorba asked for more information about the condition of the existing siding.

Commissioner Burns noted the south side appears to be replaced due to the enclosure and installation of new windows. He also asked whether the existing soffit vent would remain. Mr. Geiger stated he did not believe there were plans to remove it.

Commissioner Dysart asked whether the smooth or rough side of the cedar would be visible. Mr. Geiger stated the smooth side would be visible.

Commissioner Thurston requested additional specifications for the soffit. Mr. Geiger asked if she was referring to the type of wood. Commissioner Burns added that the Commission would like clarification on siding details, including whether the material will be smooth plywood or a wood-grain product such as Smart Lap, and whether the existing solid vent around the house will remain or be replaced with new netting. Mr. Geiger confirmed through communication with the applicant that the soffit material would be the same smooth cedar.

Commissioner Burns stated the commission would still like to see formal specifications submitted, noting that without documentation the materials could potentially be changed after approval.

Commissioner Zorba stated he could not find the specifications referenced in the proposed alterations narrative in the meeting agenda packet and requested more specific information from the applicant before approval.

Commissioner Zorba recommended a postponement of item C. Mr. Geiger agreed to postponement.

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to postpone HD 26-04 item C) replacement of exterior siding, soffit, and trim; Seconded by Commissioner Skapik

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns

### **HD 26-04 item C was postponed.**

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to approve HD 26-04 item D) enclosure of rear patio to provide additional living space, as submitted; Seconded by Commissioner Burns.

### Staff Presentation

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the staff report

Commissioner Zorba stated part of the addition is to add two more windows like the other windows presented but that item was postponed and for this reason this item might need to be postponed as well.

### Applicant Presentation

Jarrold Geiger, applicant representative, presented the proposed project.

Commissioner Burns asked whether the applicant plans to demolish the retaining wall and concrete pad shown in the photo of the rear patio area. Mr. Geiger stated he believes the plan is to demolish them.

Commissioner Zorba stated it would be helpful to have a demolition plan identifying which elements will be removed and which will remain, as it is difficult to determine the scope of work from the information provided.

Ms. Starr stated the Commission would need to recommend postponement of the item, noting that waiting for text message responses from the applicant during the meeting was taking too much time and the meeting needed to proceed.

Mr. Geiger agreed to postponement of the request.

Motion by Commissioner Posey to postpone HD 26-04 item D) enclosure of rear patio to provide additional living space; Seconded by Commissioner Thurston.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns

**HD 26-04 item D was postponed.**

## **REPORTS/UPDATES**

### **5. STAFF REPORT ON ACTIVE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE BYPASS ISSUED SINCE JANUARY 5, 2026.**

Anais Starr reported on active COAs as follows:

- 549 S. Lahoma Avenue - Applicant has submitted a COA request for the north windows, but it was subsequently withdrawn prior to the February meeting. No change from last month.
- 904 Classen Avenue - Applicant is in the process of installing windows and siding on the north side of the house. No change from last month.
- 607-609 S. Lahoma Avenue - New wood front windows installed. They have until 6/5/2028 to install remaining windows. No change from last month.
- 1320 Oklahoma Avenue - Vacant lot. No building permit have been submitted. No change since last month.
- 505 Chautauqua Avenue - Work continues.
- 643 Okmulgee Street - Work on the house is complete. Rear fence complete. Expansion of the driveway with an additional parking space has not started. No change from last month.
- 315 Castro Street - Building permit issued. Work has started.
- 502 Macy Street - Work has not started.
- 720 S. Lahoma Avenue - Work has not started.
- 301 E. Keith Street - Shutters have been removed.
- 508 Chautauqua Ave - Work has not started.

Anais Starr reported on Administrative Bypass issued since January 5, 2026:

- 508 Chautauqua - Addition of walkway in rear yard

6. DISCUSSION OF PROGRESS REPORT REGARDING FYE 2025-2026 CLG GRANT PROJECTS.

Anais Starr discussed the progress report regarding FYE 2025-2026 CLG Grant Projects.

25-26 CLG Grant Projects

- PROJECT 1: Educational Training - \$3,000
- PROJECT 2: Memberships Dues for NAPC - \$150
- PROJECT 3: Historic Tour Mobile App Maintenance - \$1,725
- PROJECT 4: Lunch and Learn Windows Programs \$1,200
- PROJECT 5: Biannual Education Postcard - \$1,800

TOTAL BUDGET OF CLG FUNDS - \$7,875

Ms. Starr explained Lunch and Learn postcards were mailed out at the beginning of February. First Lunch and Learn took place on February 27. She encouraged Commissioners who could not attend the first program to attend the second one being held on March 27.

7. DISCUSSION & CONSIDERATION OF PROJECTS FOR 2026-2027 CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT CLG FUNDS.

Anais Starr discussed projects for FYE 2026-2027 CLG Grant Projects. Ms. Starr stated 2026-27 CLG funding is anticipated to be released in the first week of March.

Staff proposes to apply for the “basics” when CLG funding is available:

- 2-3 Postcard mailings - \$1,800
- NAPC Membership for Commissioners \$150
- Tour App host software maintenance fee - \$1,725
- Conference training - \$3,000
- Lunch and Learn type workshops - \$1,500 each

Total \$8,700 approximately

Commissioner Thurston asked if other types of projects could be funded. Ms. Starr explained the CLG projects must be either education-based project or historic survey projects. She further indicated that historic surveys had become expensive in recent years.

**Motion** made by Commissioner Skapik to approve application projects for FYE 26-27 CLG funding; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Thurston, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Skapik, Commissioner Burns

**MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Passed and approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2026.

---

Historic District