



CITY OF NORMAN, OK
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING
Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069
Monday, April 06, 2026 at 5:30 PM

MINUTES

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, will meet in Regular Session in the Council Chambers at the Municipal Building, on Monday, April 06, 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 Tyler Burns

ABSENT

Commissioner Mitch Baroff
Commissioner Susan Skapik
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

Lyntha Wesner, 616 Tulsa Street
Edwin Amaya, 1320 Oklahoma Avenue
Logan Pizzeck, 415 Chautauqua Avenue
Joe Farnan, 524 Macy Street
Steven Davis 539 Shawnee Street
Linda Watson & Chris Wood, 627 E Boyd Street

MINUTES

1. 1. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE MINUTES AS FOLLOWS:
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 2, 2026.

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

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

March 2, 2026 Historic District Meeting Minutes were approved.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUESTS

2. (HD 26-06) 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 CONCRETE PATIO AND COVERED PERGOLA; B) MODIFICATIONS TO THE FRONT WALKWAY AND YARD; C) EXTENSION OF THE RETAINING WALL; D) CHANGE IN THE EXTERIOR WALL MATERIALS; E) THE ADDITION OF TWO EXTERIOR DOORS ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE STRUCTURE; F) MODIFICATIONS TO THE GARAGE DOOR DESIGN; G) MODIFICATIONS TO THE WINDOWS.

Motion made by Commissioner Burns to approve HD 26-06 item A) Modifications to the concrete patio and covered pergola, **Seconded** by Commissioner Thurston.

Staff Report

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

Commissioner Thurston asked if there was an image of the proposed polycarbonate pergola roof. Commissioner Burns referenced an image in the packet and asked Mr. Amaya if the material was translucent; Mr. Amaya confirmed it was.

Commissioner Burns sought clarification on whether the request applied to the front or rear of the property. Ms. Starr clarified it applies only to the rear.

Applicant Presentation

Edwin Amaya, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Commissioner Zorba asked about the difference in patio size from the previous request. Mr. Amaya stated the patio is increasing approximately 4–5 feet north/south and about 3 feet east/west.

Commissioner Dysart asked whether the roof would be clear or colored. Mr. Amaya stated it would be clear.

Commissioner Burns asked whether the polycarbonate roofing would be visible from the sides or enclosed. Mr. Amaya stated it would be boxed in, so it is only visible from underneath.

Commissioner Thurston sought clarification on the slab size change. Mr. Amaya stated it increased from 17'2" to approximately 22'6". Commissioner Thurston noted the previous request was 19'x15' and the new dimensions are 26'6"x13', confirming the shape was adjusted. Mr. Amaya agreed.

Commissioner Dysart stated the total increase is approximately 59.5 square feet.

Commissioner Burns asked about the new column size. Mr. Amaya confirmed it matches existing columns at 6"x6".

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Zorba noted the structure is largely screened by the backyard fence but will be visible from the alley, and the height is consistent with the previously approved design.

Commissioner Burns expressed appreciation for the change to a polycarbonate roof.

Commissioner Dysart asked whether the increased pergola size complies with maximum requirements. Ms. Starr confirmed it does.

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

The motion for HD 26-06 item A was approved.

Motion made by Commissioner Thurston to approve HD 26-06 item B) modifications to front walkway and yard; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey

Staff Report

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

Applicant Presentation

Edwin Amaya, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Commissioner Burns asked if the gravel on each side of the sidewalk was included in the previously approved proposal. Mr. Amaya stated it was a new addition.

Ms. Starr clarified the Commission does not approve or deny gravel, but does review elements requiring a permit, such as pavers and concrete.

Commissioner Zorba sought clarification on the location of the gravel and whether it was limited to areas around the sidewalk and pavers. Mr. Amaya confirmed.

Ms. Starr asked whether the material would be decorative rock or gravel. Mr. Amaya stated it would be decorative rock.

Public Comments

There were no public comments

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Thurston referenced Section 2.9.10, noting new paved areas should be compatible in dimension with existing walkways. She stated poured concrete is a permanent material and questioned widening it beyond typical sidewalk widths in the Historic District.

Commissioner Zorba stated the proposed design appears modern in both plan and isometric views and expressed concern about the increased width. He noted the paved area is significantly larger than the previously approved design and functions more like a patio. He also stated the site is somewhat unique, as it faces Oklahoma Avenue and one of the adjacent properties is across the alleyway from this property.

Commissioner Burns stated a four-foot width was not a significant concern and could support accessibility needs, though three feet is standard. However, he expressed concern with added design elements, including additional concrete for planters and pavers within gravel, stating these appear modern and are not consistent with historic character. He added he could not find similar examples in the district or other historic areas.

Commissioner Thurston stated she also reviewed the neighborhood and was unable to find comparable examples.

Commissioner Dysart stated the house itself has a modern appearance and noted new construction is not required to match existing structures. She stated, in her view, the proposed gravel and related elements are consistent with the overall design. Commissioner Thurston emphasized new structures should still fit within the existing neighborhood and expressed concern expanding poured concrete could set a precedent. She recommended maintaining the originally approved concrete dimensions and using materials such as pea gravel for additional areas.

Commissioners Dysart and Burns asked whether Commissioner Thurston's concerns applied to pavers or only the poured concrete. Commissioner Thurston clarified her concern was specifically with the poured concrete, noting widening it creates a more modern appearance inconsistent with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Zorba noted guidelines allow for modern considerations and acknowledged a four-foot width may support accessibility, though he was unsure of ADA standards. Commissioner Burns stated he believed the standard to be approximately 3'6".

Commissioner Zorba added it was difficult to fully evaluate the request without seeing the proposed exterior materials for the house.

Commissioner Burns asked how Commissioner Thurston would feel if the additional concrete adjacent to the entry was removed and replaced with planters. Commissioner Thurston stated she still had concerns about modifying permanent structural elements. Commissioner Zorba asked whether the applicant would prefer to receive feedback and postpone or proceed to a vote.

Mr. Amaya stated the additional concrete width was intended to align with the four-foot walkway and provide space for adjacent flowerbeds, not to create a modern

appearance. He acknowledged concerns about the extensions and expressed willingness to postpone and return with revised design options better align with the desired character.

Ms. Starr encouraged the Commission to provide clear feedback for revisions and asked whether the pavers would be set in concrete or sand. Mr. Amaya stated they would be set in sand.

Commissioner Zorba asked if additional details on the pavers could be provided.

Commissioner Burns added examples of style and color would be helpful. Mr. Amaya stated he will try to bring samples to a future meeting.

Mr. Amaya asked for postponement of item B.

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to postpone HD 26-06 item B) modifications to front walkway and yard; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

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

HD 26-06 item B was postponed.

Motion made by Commissioner Burns to approve HD 26-06 item C) extension of retaining wall; **Seconded** by Commissioner Thurston.

Staff Report

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

Applicant Presentation

Edwin Amaya, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Commissioner Zorba sought clarification on the location of the fence and asked whether the retaining wall would be constructed directly inside the fence along the south property line. Mr. Amaya stated the wall is currently shown on the property line but indicated he would be willing to either set it back with the fence behind it or integrate the fence posts into the wall. He clarified the fence would remain cedar as previously approved.

Commissioner Burns noted the retaining wall would need to be moved significantly inward to provide adequate separation from the fence.

Ms. Starr stated, based on her interpretation, when a retaining wall is located on the property line with a fence on top, the total combined height is limited to six feet within the Historic District. She noted the fence height could be reduced to comply if placed on top of the wall.

Commissioner Burns sought confirmation if a 30-inch retaining wall were constructed with a fence on top, the fence height would need to be reduced to maintain the maximum six-foot. Ms. Starr confirmed.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether the retaining wall would be visible from the southern neighboring property and if most of it would be buried from their perspective. Mr. Amaya confirmed.

Commissioner Thurston asked for confirmation the six-foot height limit includes both the retaining wall and fence. Ms. Starr confirmed, noting the fence height would need to be reduced accordingly.

Mr. Amaya stated neighboring property has eight-foot fences and expressed concern a reduced fence height would not provide adequate privacy.

Commissioner Burns suggested relocating the retaining wall further into the property, noting construction on the property line may require neighbor approval, particularly if drainage extends onto adjacent property. He added this approach would allow for a separate fence and potential landscaping between the wall and fence.

Mr. Amaya stated he supported this approach and noted the issue is delaying construction.

Ms. Starr clarified fence height is measured from the applicant's yard, with a maximum of six feet. She outlined two options: proceed with the proposal as presented or postpone and return with a revised plan clearly showing the relationship between the retaining wall and fence, including coordination with neighbors. She noted uncertainty regarding whether adjacent property owners had been consulted and Commission concerns relate to the combined height exceeding expectations.

Commissioner Burns asked how close the pergola is to the rear property line. Mr. Amaya stated it is very close, which is why it was pushed back in the revised plan. He reiterated concerns about privacy if the fence height is reduced and stated he would prefer to keep the fence and wall separate, maintaining the previously approved six-foot fence.

Commissioner Zorba stated if the fence and wall remain separate, he would not see an issue with approval, however, if combined, the height would be problematic.

Commissioner Burns suggested an alternative configuration with the retaining wall, followed by 18–24 inches of landscaping, and then the fence at the property line.

Commissioner Zorba noted placing soil between a wooden fence and concrete wall may lead to deterioration of the wood and create maintenance concerns such as weed growth, leaving consideration to the applicant.

Public Comments

Chris Wood, 627 E Boyd Street (protest)

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Thurston sought clarification the retaining wall would be constructed away from the property line, backfilled to match the neighboring grade, with the fence installed at the top.

Commissioner Zorba asked whether the six-foot fence would be measured from the top of the backfill.

Ms. Starr reiterated the City does not require permits for fences but does require permits for retaining walls. She also clarified the City does not determine property lines or mediate fence disputes, as those require a survey. It was noted a neighboring property owner may request a six-foot fence.

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

HD 26-06 item C was approved.

Motion by Commissioner Dysart to approve HD 26-06 item D) change in exterior wall material; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

Staff Report

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

Applicant Presentation

Edwin Amaya, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Commissioner Burns sought clarification on the brick color, noting it appeared different in the packet than what was presented. Mr. Amaya stated the rendering was updated to better reflect the selected brick color after it previously appeared inconsistent.

Commissioner Zorba asked which brick sample from the packet would be used.

Commissioner Burns noted the applicant selected a different supplier, so it was not one of the samples included.

Public Comments

Steven Davis, 539 Shawnee Street (protest)
Joe Farnan, 524 Macy Street (support)
Linda Watson, 627 E Boyd (protest)

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Thurston asked if images of the previously approved design were available, noting the current proposal differs significantly. Ms. Starr stated that the original design drawings had been emailed to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Zorba stated the design is aesthetically pleasing overall and expressed no concern with brick or stone individually, however, they noted the combination and application of materials, particularly the cedar, creates a more modern appearance. He added the design differs from a traditional Colonial Revival style and the primary difference lies in the use and combination of materials.

Commissioner Thurston stated concerns extend beyond materials, emphasizing the removal of previously discussed architectural details intended to reduce a modern appearance. She noted the removal of garage and window trim, along with changes to the windows and added cedar, alters the overall design.

Commissioner Dysart noted cedar shutters had previously been installed on a nearby property but were required to be removed, and expressed concern about consistency with requirement.

Commissioner Thurston recalled prior discussions emphasizing the importance of architectural details, such as garage and gable elements and window trim, to better fit the neighborhood. She noted surrounding homes reflect those features and the previous design was more consistent.

Commissioner Burns stated, after visualizing the proposed brick design on the lot, she felt it does not fit the surrounding style and the original design appeared more intentional and better suited to the property.

Commissioner Zorba expressed concern with the front patio, noting elements such as gravel and landscaping contribute to a more modern appearance may not be compatible with the house or surrounding area, though the design itself is attractive.

Ms. Starr summarized the concern appears to be a lack of elements to soften the design, noting the current proposal lacks the detail and variation of the previously approved design. She stated the issue is not solely a material change, but a broader design shift, and noted the Commission could either deny the request or allow the applicant to postpone for revisions.

Commissioner Burns asked the applicant about the reason for the material change.

Mr. Amaya stated the shift to brick was due to a potential decision to occupy the home and a preference for durability. He explained design elements remain intentional, including the use of soldier courses, and acknowledged concerns with the cedar, indicating it may be revised.

Commissioner Thurston asked about the windows shown in the rendering. Ms. Starr clarified window discussion would occur under a separate item. Mr. Amaya stated the windows would remain as previously approved and the rendering may not accurately reflect them.

Commissioner Zorba stated they would not support approval as presented and suggested postponement to allow for revisions.

Ms. Starr noted the previously approved design remains valid and could be implemented without review by the Commission.

Mr. Amaya stated he was willing to postpone and return with revised options incorporating Commission feedback.

Commissioner Burns suggested incorporating siding with the brick to reduce the overall mass.

Commissioner Thurston recommended retaining window trim consistent with the approved design.

Mr. Amaya asked for clarification on whether concerns were related to the amount of brick, lack of detail, or the use of brick itself.

Ms. Starr clarified concerns were primarily with the amount of brick on a two-story structure on a smaller lot, resulting in an overwhelming appearance which is not compatible with the neighborhood. She suggested reviewing other two-story brick homes in the area for guidance.

Commissioner Burns stated the previously approved design was strong and expressed preference for a design closer to proposal.

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to postpone HD 26-06 item D) change in exterior wall material; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

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

HD 26-06 item D was postponed.

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to approve HD 26-06 item E) Addition of two exterior doors on the south side of the structure; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

Staff Report

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

Commissioner Thurston sought clarification on the zoning of the property. Ms. Starr confirmed it is zoned R-1.

Applicant Presentation

Edwin Amaya, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Commissioner Zorba asked about the material the proposed doors. Mr. Amaya stated they are the same doors previously approved for the ADU.

Public Comments

There were no public comments

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Zorba stated, even if the exterior design changes, he does not have concerns with the two doors.

Commissioner Dysart confirmed the doors are the same as previously approved and stated she supports having a door from the garage to the side yard.

Commissioner Burns noted there was previously a door in a similar location associated with the ADU, and it has now been relocated to the exterior of the primary structure.

Commissioner Thurston stated while relocating a door from an ADU is a separate issue, multiple exterior doors, particularly in an R-1 zoning district, are not appropriate and detract from the historic character and intended use of the home.

Commissioner Dysart asked whether the doors would be visible from the street. Ms. Starr stated there is no rendering available to confirm visibility, but yes a portion of the tops of the doors would be visible from the front streetscape

Commissioner Zorba stated in prior renderings it appears the tops of the doors may be visible, and while he understands Commissioner Thurston's concern, it does not present an issue for him.

Mr. Amaya stated, since the overall design has already been approved, he would prefer this item move forward to a vote, noting the door placement would not change with revisions to exterior materials.

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

Voting No: Commissioner Thurston

HD 26-06 item E was approved.

Mr. Amaya stated he would like to postpone item F.

Motion by Commissioner Dysart to postpone HD 26-06 item F) Modifications to the garage door design; **Seconded** by Commissioner Thurston.

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

HD 26-06 item F was postponed.

Motion by Commissioner Burns to approve HD 26-06 item G) modifications to the windows; **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey

Staff Report

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

Commissioner Thurston asked whether the previously approved windows were aluminum clad. Mr. Amaya confirmed they were aluminum clad in black and stated only the window locations are being changed, not the material.

Applicant Presentation

Edwin Amaya, the applicant, presented the proposed modifications.

Commissioner Thurston asked if the change in front window placement was due to the kitchen being located near the front door. Mr. Amaya confirmed.

Ms. Starr confirmed the proposed windows are the same size as those in the original structure located on this lot that had been demolished.

Public Comments

Lyntha Wessner, 616 Tulsa Street (Protest)

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Burns asked for confirmation that the windows had been previously approved. Ms. Starr confirmed.

Commissioner Zorba stated he does not have concerns with the revised window locations.

Commissioner Thurston stated, as long as the windows remain aluminum clad as previously approved, she has no concerns with the updated locations.

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

HD 26-06 item G was approved.

REPORTS/UPDATES

3. STAFF REPORT ON ACTIVE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE BYPASS ISSUED SINCE MARCH 2, 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 submitted. Applicant submitted amendments to COAs to be reviewed at tonight's meeting.
- 505 Chautauqua Avenue - Work continues.

- 643 Okmulgee Street - Work on house complete. Rear fence complete. Expansion of driveway with an additional parking space has not started. No change from March. COA will expire in May.
- 467 College Ave - Work on covered near completion. ADU walls started. Too muddy for updated pictures.
- 325 Keith Street - Building permit submitted and approved. Work has not started. Exterior work started on the rear of the structure but not visible to the front yet.
- 315 Castro Street – Garage almost complete.
- 502 Macy Street - Garage and storm shelter demolition complete. Footing for garage completed.
- 508 Chautauqua Ave - Building permit submitted and issued. Work has not started.
- 720 S. Lahoma Ave - Work has not started.
- 735 S Lahoma Ave – Building permit submitted
- 452 S Lahoma Ave – Work not started.

Anais Starr reported on Administrative Bypass issued since March 2, 2026:

- None

4. 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

5. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE APPLICATION FOR FUNDS FOR THE FYE 2026-2027 CLG PROGRAM WITH THE OKLAHOMA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

Anais Starr discussed projects for FYE 2026-2027 CLG Grant Projects. Ms. Starr stated if the 2026-27 CLG application was approved by the Commission tonight it will be brought to City Council on April 14th for final approval and submitted shortly after Council approval.

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

- 2 Postcard mailings - \$2,000
- NAPC Membership for Commissioners \$200
- Tour App host software maintenance fee - \$1,725
- Conference training - \$3,000
- Lunch and Learn type workshops - \$1,950

Total \$8,875

Motion made by Commissioner Burns to approve the FYE 26-27 CLG application, **Seconded** by Commissioner Posey.

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

Motion to approve the FYE 26-27 CLG application was approved.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

Ms. Starr discussed future application submittal requirements and new procedures for staff presenting applications to the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Passed and approved this _____ day of _____ 2026.

Historic District