



CITY OF NORMAN, OK
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING
Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069
Monday, June 01, 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, June 01, 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 Mitch Baroff
Commissioner Michael Zorba
Commissioner Jo Ann Dysart
Commissioner Kendel Posey
Commissioner Tyler Burns
Commissioner Trent Baggett

ABSENT

Commissioner Karen Thurston
Commissioner Susan Skapik

STAFF PRESENT

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

GUESTS PRESENT

Matt Seaton, 413 S Lahoma, Norman, OK
Steve Davis, 539 Shawnee St., Norman, OK
Linda Watson, 627 E. Boyd, Norman, OK
Chris Wood, 627 E. Boyd, Norman, OK
Edwin Amaya, 1320 Oklahoma Ave, Norman, OK

MINUTES

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

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 4, 2026.

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

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Baggett

May 04, 2026 Historic District Meeting Minutes were approved.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUESTS

2. (HD 26-07) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED 413 S LAHOMA AVENUE FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: A) CONSTRUCTION OF A DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT. (Postponed from the May 4, 2026, meeting).

Motion made by Commissioner Burns to approve (HD 26-07) item A) construction of a detached accessory dwelling unit, as submitted, **Seconded** by Commissioner Dysart.

Staff Report

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

Matt Seaton, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Commissioner Zorba inquired about the reduction in the ridge height of the ADU. The applicant responded that the ridge height had been reduced by eight feet.

Commissioner Dysart noted that the plans referenced "limited visibility." The applicant explained that the ADU is situated five feet from the fence line and is not visible due to the elevation change at the rear of the property.

Commissioner Burns asked whether the applicant would be willing to combine elements from the various options presented. The applicant stated that the property owners would be open to considering modifications but want the preferred elements of Option 1.

Commissioner Zorba asked about the orientation of the entry door. The applicant stated that the door faces south, toward the alley, and explained that due to the gable design of the structure, the front door will not be visible from either the alley or the primary residence.

Commissioner Baroff commented favorably on the proposed design.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Baroff stated that he could support the proposal and noted that the proposed siding appeared similar to that of the primary structure. He asked whether

the applicant had been able to locate matching siding for the main residence. The applicant responded that a matching wood product had been located from a supplier in Central Texas.

Commissioner Burns requested to see an image of the steel entry door proposed in Option 1.

Commissioner Baggett raised questions regarding the security implications of a steel door with glass panels. The applicant responded that the door selection reflected the property owners' preference.

Ms. Starr clarified that Option 1, as submitted, proposed LP SmartSide paired with a steel entry door, which was the applicant's preferred option. Option 2 proposed wood siding matching the primary structure along with a wood entry door.

Motion made by Commissioner Baroff to amend (HD 26-07) to approve Option 1 with LP SmartSide and metal entry door, **Seconded** by Commissioner Dysart.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Baggett

The motion to amend HD 26-07 to approve Option 1 with LP SmartSide and metal entry door was approved.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Burns.

Voting Nay: Commissioner Baggett

HD 26-07 Option 1 with LP SmartSide and metal entry door was approved as amended.

3. (HD 26-10) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF AMENDMENTS TO CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS 24-08 AND 25-04 FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1320 OKLAHOMA AVENUE FOR THE FOLLOWING: A) MODIFICATIONS TO THE FRONT WALKWAY AND YARD; B) MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR WALL MATERIALS; C) MODIFICATIONS TO THE GARAGE DOOR DESIGN; D) MODIFICATIONS TO WINDOWS. (Items A, B, and C were postponed from the April 6, 2026, meeting.)

Motion made by Commissioner Burns to approve (HD26-10) Item A) modifications to the front walkway and yard; Item B) modifications to the exterior wall materials; Item C) modifications to the garage door design; Item D) modifications to windows. As submitted. **Seconded** by Commissioner Dysart.

Staff Report

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

Edwin Amaya, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Public Comments

Commissioner Zorba opened the public comment portion of the hearing.

Linda Watson, resident of 627 E. Boyd Street, provided public comment. Ms. Watson stated the design had not substantially changed since it was first presented two months earlier, aside from the replacement of cedar elements with stone. She expressed concerns that the proposed design remained too modern for the neighborhood. Ms. Watson also raised concerns regarding potential traffic and parking impacts associated with a home of this size. She questioned the length of the approval process and whether any deadlines were approaching. Ms. Watson noted that demolition of the previous structure took approximately two years and required City intervention. She further stated ongoing construction in the surrounding area was already affecting neighborhood access. Ms. Watson did not believe the proposed patio was comparable to examples presented by the applicant and reiterated that the overall design was too modern for the area.

Steve Davis, resident of 539 Shawnee Street, also spoke during public comment. Mr. Davis echoed Ms. Watson's concerns, stating the design had not changed significantly and remained incompatible with the historic character of the neighborhood. He commented the proposed combination of brick, siding, and stone was not typical of nearby homes and noted that the examples presented by the applicant were primarily brick structures rather than a mix of materials.

Commissioner Zorba closed the public comment period and moved the discussion to the Commission.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Baggett asked the applicant whether he was serving as the builder, architect, homeowner, or all three. He also asked whether the structure would be a single-family residence or duplex and questioned why the patio was not located in the backyard.

The applicant stated he was serving as the builder, architect, and homeowner. He confirmed the project would be a single-family residence and noted that a backyard patio was already planned. He explained the proposed front patio was intended to take advantage of the view and stated that he would be willing to remove the pavers if necessary.

Commissioner Baggett asked why construction had not begun since approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness more than 14 months earlier and inquired about the changes to the façade from the previously approved design.

The applicant explained his original intention had been to rehabilitate the existing duplex; however, safety concerns ultimately required demolition of the structure. He further stated he preferred the appearance of brick over the previously approved siding.

Commissioner Burns asked about the proposed paving materials. The applicant provided physical samples of the pavers for Commission review.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether the applicant had selected a brick for the project. The applicant confirmed a standard king-size brick would be used, consistent with the information provided during the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness.

Commissioner Zorba asked about the brick color and a representative image. The applicant presented a photograph of the intended brick color and acknowledged that brick color was not within the Commission's review authority. Commissioner Zorba observed the proposed brick appeared to be a neutral pink tone, in contrast to the predominantly red brick found on nearby homes.

Commissioner Zorba expressed concern that the proposed stone detailing, including the stone surround entryway, and wainscot, contributed to an overly modern appearance. He indicated brick detailing above the windows rather than stone would be more appropriate with the Southridge District.

Commissioner Baroff stated that he did not object to the use of brick and stone but noted that stone above the windows was an unusual design feature. He complimented the applicant on his presentation and for providing examples of nearby homes containing design elements similar to those proposed. Commissioner Baroff acknowledged the design was somewhat modern but observed the Southridge Addition contained a variety of architectural styles.

Commissioner Posey stated he viewed the proposed front feature as an entryway rather than a porch or patio and expressed support for the addition. However, he stated he did not support the overall modern appearance of the structure and did not believe it was appropriate for the neighborhood. Commissioner Posey further stated he preferred the previously approved brick and LP SmartSide design, while supporting the proposed garage door and window modifications.

Commissioner Zorba agreed with Commissioner Posey's comments regarding the windows and stated the proposed design would be more compatible if the stone elements were removed.

The applicant requested clarification regarding which stone elements were considered problematic. Commissioner Zorba responded with concerns centered primarily on the stone entry treatment and the stone window headers.

The applicant stated those elements had not been identified as concerns during previous discussions and he would have prepared alternative options had he known the stone detailing was the primary issue. He indicated a willingness to remove the stone headers, replace them with brick, return to the previously approved cedar entry treatment, retain limited stone wainscoting, and incorporate LP SmartSide on the gable ends.

Commissioner Burns asked whether the applicant would be willing to eliminate the stone entry treatment and other front-facing stone elements. The applicant responded he was willing to make those changes and emphasized his desire to move the project forward.

Commissioner Zorba stated the Commission was not attempting to design the project but was offering suggestions to help facilitate approval.

The applicant reiterated that many homes in the neighborhood utilize brick and stone materials and noted the property is classified as non-contributing within the historic district. He stated there appeared to be a disconnect between the Commission's preferences and the architectural character already present in the neighborhood.

Ms. Starr stated, based on her recollection of the previous meeting, the Commission appeared more supportive of the previously approved LP SmartSide design. She noted concerns with the current proposal were not necessarily related to the use of brick itself, but rather to the overall design and level of architectural detailing associated with the brick-and-stone façade. Ms. Starr reiterated it is not the Commission's role to design projects and stated the concerns appeared to center on the overall composition of the proposal rather than any single material.

Commissioner Zorba requested the previously submitted design and the design presented at the June HDC meeting be displayed for comparison.

Commissioner Burns observed the current proposal was generally similar to the previous design, but the previous design included cedar elements.

Commissioner Zorba stated his intent was not to redesign the project but to better understand the differences between the approved design and the current proposal.

The applicant explained the previous design included cedar headers above the windows and entryway, an eight-foot garage door, stone accents, and brick extending to the roofline.

Commissioner Baggett asked whether the applicant had considered constructing a front porch rather than the proposed patio area.

The applicant responded that a front porch had been his original preference; however, the required 25-foot setback prevented the addition of a covered structure in that location.

Commissioner Baggett inquired whether the setback requirement was subject to Commission approval. Ms. Starr clarified the setback requirement is established by City Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Burns asked whether the soffit shown in the previously approved rendering was stained cedar. The applicant confirmed it was and stated the same stained cedar soffit remained part of the current design.

Commissioner Burns sought clarification that the stained cedar soffit depicted in the rendering represented an actual design element rather than a rendering effect. Ms. Starr asked whether he was referring to the soffit or the gable ends. Commissioner Burns clarified that he was referring specifically to the soffit on the front elevation. He noted the eaves appeared to consist of tongue-and-groove cedar soffit material.

The applicant confirmed that Commissioner Burns' understanding was correct and noted the stained cedar soffit was part of the previously approved design.

Commissioner Burns requested clarification as to whether all visible soffit material on the front elevation would be stained cedar. The applicant indicated it would.

Commissioner Zorba stated he did not believe the proposed materials were fully compatible and expressed concern regarding the amount of stone incorporated into the design.

Commissioner Dysart asked whether the applicant would be willing to substitute brick for the stone elements shown in the proposal.

The applicant stated the project had been under review for an extended period and, had he understood the stone detailing to be a primary concern, he would have prepared additional alternatives for Commission consideration. He proposed removing the stone window headers and replacing them with brick detailing. He also suggested removing the stone arch at the entry and returning to the previously approved cedar portico design while retaining a limited amount of stone in other areas.

The applicant explained this approach would allow the stained wood soffit and cedar entry portico to complement one another. He further proposed using brick as the primary exterior material, retaining limited stone accents, and incorporating LP SmartSide on the gable ends.

Commissioner Zorba stated he would need to review a rendering of the proposed revisions before being comfortable enough to make a decision, noting that descriptions can be interpreted differently by different individuals. He asked whether the proposed entry feature would be constructed of cedar.

The applicant responded that the entry would utilize the wood entry design approved at previous meetings and would be incorporated into the current rendering. He stated that the window headers would be removed and replaced with brick detailing while retaining stone elements at the front of the structure.

Commissioner Zorba clarified his understanding that the proposal would incorporate the entry design from the previously approved rendering into the current building design while retaining the wainscot treatment. He noted that while the entry design had been previously approved, he was not entirely comfortable voting on the revised proposal without first reviewing an updated rendering.

Ms. Starr suggested that certain minor modifications could potentially be approved, such as replacing the proposed window headers with a brick soldier course, as sufficient illustrations had been provided for that element. She noted that approving more extensive changes could become complicated.

The applicant then proposed an alternative option that would remove all stone elements from the design. Under this proposal, the previously approved cedar portico would be reinstated, and the exterior would consist of brick and siding consistent with the previously approved design.

Commissioner Baroff sought clarification regarding the revised proposal, stating his understanding that the structure would be primarily brick with a wood entry surround and a recessed entry door. He further inquired whether the side panels adjacent to the entry would be brick or wood.

Commissioner Zorba clarified Commissioner Baroff's question regarding the materials shown within the entry area of the rendering. The applicant stated that the approved material was cedar and that he did not intend to alter that aspect of the design.

Commissioner Baroff summarized his understanding that all exterior materials would be brick, with the exception of the previously approved cedar elements. The applicant confirmed that understanding.

Commissioner Zorba stated he could support the proposal as described.

Commissioner Baggett confirmed the window sizes would remain unchanged, and the proposed garage door modification was limited to the addition of windowpanes along the top of the door. He stated he had no concerns with those proposed changes.

The applicant stated he appreciated the Commission's feedback and reiterated his desire to move the project forward. He summarized the proposed revisions as removing the stone elements, retaining siding on the gable ends, replacing the LP SmartSide with brick as shown in the submitted samples, adding a row of windows to the garage door, maintaining the previously approved seven-foot garage door height, and reinstating the previously approved cedar entryway design.

Commissioner Baggett stated he did not want his personal preferences to overshadow the applicant's design choices and expressed interest in reviewing the plans that had been approved prior to his service on the Commission.

Ms. Starr stated, during the April meeting, the Commission had expressed concerns over the brick design that appeared overly modern and lacked sufficient architectural detailing. She noted the applicant's previous rendering had been generated using artificial intelligence and may not have adequately represented the intended design. Ms. Starr stated previous concerns centered on the combination of materials and the overall design composition, as well as the loss of architectural detail resulting from the transition from LP SmartSide to brick.

Commissioner Baggett asked whether the concerns expressed by Commissioners at the prior meeting had been adequately addressed.

Ms. Starr responded not all Commissioners who attended the prior meeting were present at the current meeting.

Commissioner Burns noted the LP SmartSide design had been approved approximately fourteen months earlier and the porch concept had first been presented two months ago. He further stated the porch was not part of the original approval.

Commissioner Zorba displayed the design presented at the April meeting and noted the Commission had requested the applicant return with additional alternatives.

The Commission reviewed the current proposal alongside previously submitted designs to identify and discuss the differences between the various versions.

During the review, Commissioner Zorba noted during the April meeting, the Commission had expressed concerns the design appeared overly modern due to the inclusion of cedar elements.

Following the comparison, Commissioner Zorba stated the Commission had been sufficiently reminded of the previously submitted proposal and the concerns discussed at earlier meetings.

Commissioner Zorba called for a recess at 6:50 p.m. and directed attendees to reconvene at 6:55 p.m.

The meeting was reconvened at 6:55 p.m. Commissioner Zorba noted no discussion had taken place during the recess.

Following the recess, Commissioner Baggett stated the proposed structure represented a significant increase in scale compared to the previous structure on the property. He expressed concern that the design appeared larger and more modern than many of the surrounding historic homes. Commissioner Baggett acknowledged the property is classified as a non-contributing lot within the Southridge Historic District. He asked whether the Commission had previously discussed and resolved those concerns.

Ms. Starr responded that concerns regarding the design had been raised at the prior meeting and the applicant had been asked to return with a revised proposal.

Commissioner Baggett asked whether it was reasonable to conclude that those concerns remained unresolved.

Ms. Starr stated the concerns could still be relevant and that it would be up to the Commissioners to determine whether they had been adequately addressed.

The applicant discussed the differences between the previously approved LP SmartSide proposal and the current design. He explained the current rendering incorporated wood trim around the windows and additional architectural detailing between the first and second stories. The applicant stated he had added headers and windowsills to create shadow lines around the windows and between the second floor and roofline. He also noted the addition of architectural detailing between the first and second floors and above the garage. The applicant stated the use of brick added warmth and texture that he believed was compatible with nearby homes.

The applicant further stated, following the Commission's previous direction, he had surveyed surrounding properties and incorporated observations from those homes into his revised design. He referenced photographs of neighboring houses and noted several contained less architectural detailing than the proposed structure.

The applicant stated he had incorporated additional details and revised the design in response to comments received at prior meetings. He further noted the Commission had previously reviewed and approved the overall scale and massing of the structure. The applicant stated similar architectural features can be found elsewhere within the surrounding Historic District and that the proposal was consistent with existing development patterns in the area rather than being unique to this property.

Commissioner Burns inquired about the proposed brick color and whether brick color falls under the Commission's review authority.

Mrs. Starr stated brick color is not within the Commission's purview; however, she noted the brick must remain unpainted.

The applicant stated the previously approved design included a horizontal reveal that created a shadow line which was not clearly depicted in the rendering. He explained the proposed design incorporates the same horizontal reveal around the building, creating a shadow line between the second floor and the gable ends. He also noted additional architectural detailing had been incorporated around the windows.

The applicant further stated he had considered comments made during the previous meeting and had reviewed nearby homes to better align the proposal with existing neighborhood character.

Commissioner Zorba expressed appreciation for the additional details provided in the proposal and asked whether a brick soldier course was included between the first and second floors.

The applicant confirmed a brick soldier course was included between the first and second floors.

Commissioner Zorba stated the addition of the brick soldier course created a shadow line that enhanced the appearance of the structure. He remarked the revised proposal appeared less box-like than the version presented at the April meeting. Commissioner Zorba thanked the applicant for his presentation and for providing photographs of neighboring homes as examples of established architectural character within the area.

Commissioner Zorba stated he would be willing to consider a proposal incorporating the previously approved entry design, removal of the stone elements, and the inclusion of the proposed brick soldier courses and headers.

The Commission briefly discussed whether to consider all proposed modifications as a single action or to vote on each modification separately.

Commissioner Dysart stated she did not oppose the use of brick but believed the stone elements should be removed because they contributed to a more modern appearance. She thanked the applicant for his willingness to incorporate elements from the previously approved design. Commissioner Dysart stated she had no concerns regarding the proposed garage window lights and considered it a practical addition. She also indicated support for evaluating the proposed front seating area under the applicable Preservation Guidelines, noting she was unaware of any Guideline that would prohibit the feature. Commissioner Dysart further acknowledged a porch was not feasible due to City setback requirements.

Commissioner Zorba suggested voting proceed by considering each requested modification separately.

Commissioner Dysart withdrew her second to approve (HD 26-10) Items A, B, C, and D as submitted, Commissioner Burns withdrew his motion to approve (HD 26-10) Items A, B, C, and D, as submitted. The **Motion** was withdrawn.

Motion made by Commissioner Baroff to approve (HD 26-10) item A) Modifications to the front walkway and yard, Option A only, **Seconded** by Commissioner Burns

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Burns
Voting Nay: Commissioner Baggett

HD 26-10 Item A) Modifications to the front walkway and yard, Option A only, was approved.

Motion made by Commissioner Baroff to approve (HD 26-10) item B) Modifications to the front walkway and yard, as submitted except to have brick exterior only with no stone, and the wood entryway as previously approved, **Seconded** by Commissioner Dysart.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Baggett

HD 26-10 item B) Modifications to the front walkway and yard as submitted, was approved with the following modifications: brick exterior only with no stone elements, and a wood entryway as previously approved.

Motion made by Commissioner Dysart to approve (HD 26-10) item C) Modifications to the garage door design, as submitted, **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Baggett

HD 26-10 item C) Modifications to the garage door design, was approved as submitted.

Motion made by Commissioner Burns to approve (HD 26-10) item D) Modifications to windows, as submitted, **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Baggett

HD 26-10 item D) Modifications to windows, was approved as submitted.

4. (HD 26-11) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE AMENDMENT OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED 467 COLLEGE AVENUE FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION: A) REMOVAL OF EXTERIOR DOOR AND REPLACEMENT WITH WOOD SIDING.

Prior to consideration of the motion, Commissioner Burns recused himself from the discussion and vote due to his role as the applicant for the item under consideration.

Following Commissioner Burns' recusal, Commissioner Zorba restated the motion for the benefit of the Commission before proceeding with discussion and consideration.

Motion made by Commissioner Posey, to approve (HD 26-11) modification A) removal of exterior door and replacement with wood siding, as submitted. **Seconded** by Commissioner Dysart.

Staff Report

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer, presented the Staff Report.

Applicant Presentation

Commissioner Burns, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Public Comments

No public comments were received.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Zorba stated that, in his opinion, the proposal met the applicable Preservation Guidelines and represented a logical response to the interior layout of the structure. He indicated that he was prepared to proceed with a vote.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Baroff, Commissioner Zorba, Commissioner Dysart, Commissioner Posey, Commissioner Baggett
Voting Abstaining: Commissioner Burns

HD 26-11 modification A) removal of exterior door and replacement with wood siding, was approved as submitted.

REPORTS/UPDATES

5. STAFF REPORT ON ACTIVE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE BYPASS ISSUED SINCE MAY 4, 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. Jeanne Snider gave an update that the applicant had been informed that a COA request for the north windows would need to be submitted for the property owner to avoid City's further enforcement actions.
- 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. Ms. Starr stated the removed wall material had been static since October. The exterior condition had been turned over to Code Compliance to work an exterior property issue.
- 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 has been submitted. No change since last month.
- 467 College Ave – Work on ADU and house continues.
- 325 Keith Street – Building permit submitted and approved. Work has not started. Exterior prep work started at the rear of the structure but is not visible to the front. Applicant is requesting an amendment to COA.
- 315 Castro Street – Garage almost complete. Waiting on the overhead garage door to be delivered.
- 502 Macy Street – Garage and storm shelter demolition complete. Walls on garage are complete. Updated picture shown.
- 508 Chautauqua Ave – Building permit submitted and issued. Preparation work continues.
- 720 S. Lahoma Avenue – Pergola in rear yard installed.
- 533 S. Lahoma – Building permit issued. Foundation has been installed.
- 735 S. Lahoma – Work has not started.
- 452 S. Lahoma – Work has not started. No change from last month.

Anais Starr reported on Administrative Bypass issued since May 4, 2026:

- 502 Macy Street – 6’ wood fence in rear yard.
- 515 Miller Avenue – Removal of synthetic material to reveal original wood siding.

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 that the final expense to be paid from the 2025–2026 CLG Grant funds would be a training opportunity for her, though the details were still being finalized. She also stated the City’s NAPC membership renewal had been completed and an updated mailing list had been provided to NAPC, so Commissioners should begin receiving emails and correspondence from the organization.

DISCUSSION

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Passed and approved this _____ day of _____ 2026.

Historic District Chair