



CITY OF NORMAN, OK
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING
Development Center, Room A, 225 N. Webster Ave., Norman, OK 73069
Monday, July 07, 2025 at 5:30 PM

MINUTES

The Historic District Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in Conference Room A at the Development Center, on Monday, July 07, 2025 at 5:30 PM and notice of the agenda of the meeting was posted at the Development Center, at 225 N Webster Avenue, and on the City website at least 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Michael Zorba called the meeting to order at 5:32 P.M.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Commissioner Jo Ann Dysart
Commissioner Sarah Brewer
Commissioner Taber Halford
Commissioner Gregory Heiser
Commissioner Chair Michael Zorba
Commissioner Karen Thurston

ABSENT

Commissioner Mitch Baroff
Commissioner Barrett Williamson
Commissioner Kendel Posey

STAFF PRESENT

Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation Officer
Amanda Stevens, Development Center Coordinator
Jeanne Snider, Assistant City Attorney II

GUESTS PRESENT

Travis Kanard, 510 Shawnee St.
Stacy Pattillo & John Williams, 315 Castro St.
Zoen Finch, 538 Chautauqua Ave.
George LeVan, 644 Tulsa St.
Ryan Stover, 643 Okmulgee St.
Tyler Burns, 467 College Ave.
Mark Krittenbrink, Krittenbrink Architecture, 119 W. Main St.

MINUTES

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

Motion by Commissioner Heiser to approve the June 2, 2025, meeting minutes; **Second** by Commissioner Dysart.

The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

*

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUESTS

2. (HD 25-17) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 643 OKMULGEE STREET FOR THE INSTALLATION OF AN 8-FOOT WOOD FENCE ON THE REAR PROPERTY LINE.

Motion by Commissioner Halford to approve item (HD 25-17) as submitted; **Second** by Commissioner Brewer.

Anais Starr presented the staff report:

- Ms. Starr stated there are currently three different fence types with three different heights. The applicant, Mr. Stover, stated he wanted a consistent look along the entire rear property line.

Ryan Stover, the applicant, presented the item:

- Mr. Stover stated he consulted with his neighbor to the north who wished to have an 8-foot wood fence to match the existing 8-foot wood fence found along a portion of the property line.

Public Comments:

- George LeVan, 644 Tulsa Street, stated he and his wife were the adjacent neighbors to the north of Mr. Stover and were in favor of the approval for the proposed fence.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Halford stated this fence meets the Preservation Guidelines since it does not block any streetscape view of historic structures.
- Commissioners Brewer and Dysart agreed with Commissioner Halford.

The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

*

3. (HD 25-13) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 538 CHAUTAUQUA AVENUE FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: B) REPLACEMENT OF OVERHEAD GARAGE DOORS. (*This item was postponed from the June 2, 2025, meeting*)

Motion by Commissioner Brewer to approve item (HD 25-13) as submitted; **Second** by Commissioner Thurston.

Anais Starr presented the staff report:

- Ms. Starr explained that the Commission postponed the garage door request at the June 2nd Historic District meeting to allow the applicant time to propose an alternative door. She further explained the applicant had submitted a metal overhead garage door with composite trim for consideration by the Commission.

Zoen Finch, representing the applicant, presented the item:

- Mr. Finch stated the new proposed garage door would be white aluminum with recessed panels and composite trim.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Zorba stated the Commission only allows smooth finish composite overlay; therefore, the motion needs to be amended to reflect this change.

Motion by Commissioner Heiser to amend the request for replacement of the garage doors with smooth finish trim; **Second** by Commissioner Thurston.

The motion was amended with a vote of 6-0.

The amended motion was approved with a vote of 6-0.

*

4. (HD 25-18) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 315 CASTRO STREET FOR THE DEMOLITION OF THE GARAGE.

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to approve item (HD 25-18) as submitted; **Second** by Commissioner Heiser.

Anais Starr presented the staff report:

- Ms. Starr stated this property is a contributing structure to the Miller Historic District.
- Ms. Starr explained the garage is considered a non-contributing structure.
- Ms. Starr further explained the garage structure is located on a sewer line requiring replacement.

Stacy Pattillo & John Williams, the applicants, presented the item:

- The applicants stated their home is having significant plumbing issues, requiring the main sewer line to the house to be replaced. The applicants further stated replacing the main sewer line would require demolition of garage.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Halford stated his concern in approving the item was the applicants would have to come before the Commission again for approval of a new structure. He further stated the new proposed design may or may not be approvable by the Commission. The applicants stated they understood.
- Commissioner Thurston stated the approval of the demolition is necessary to address the plumbing issue.

The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

*

5. (HD 25-19) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 467 COLLEGE AVENUE FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: A) REMOVAL OF A NON-ORIGINAL REAR ADDITION; B) INSTALLATION OF A COVERED PATIO TO THE REAR OF THE STRUCTURE; C) CONSTRUCTION OF A DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT.

Anais Starr presented the staff report:

- Ms. Starr stated this structure is contributing to the Chautauqua Historic District.
- Ms. Starr explained the property is zoned R-1 allowing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU).
- Ms. Starr further explained the proposed ADU is 650 square feet, which meets the Preservation Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance.

Tyler Burns, representing the applicant, presented the item:

- Mr. Burns stated the rear addition on the house is dilapidated and has flooding issues within the addition.
- Mr. Burns further stated aluminum-clad wood windows would be used on the proposed ADU.

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to approve (HD 25-19) Item A removal of a non-original addition as submitted; **Second** by Commissioner Brewer.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Brewer stated the rear addition is not original to the home, and due to the flooding issues, the rear addition meets Preservation Guidelines for demolition.
- Commissioner Zorba stated he supports the demolition of the rear addition.

The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

Motion by Commissioner Dysart to approve (HD 25-19) Item B installation of a covered patio to the rear of the structure as submitted; **Second** by Commissioner Thurston.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Zorba stated a covered patio on the rear of the structure should not be visible from the front streetscape.

The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to approve (HD 25-19) Item C construction of a detached accessory dwelling unit as submitted; **Second** by Commissioner Heiser.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Halford stated the ADU will not be visible from the front right of way.
- Commissioner Thurston inquired about the proposed materials to be utilized for the ADU. Mr. Burns stated an 8-inch smooth Hardie lap siding and aluminum-clad wood windows and doors are proposed for the ADU.
- Commissioner Brewer suggested the windows on the ADU should be three-over-one configuration as found in the house. She further stated the Guidelines indicated windows in new structures must match the existing principal structure. Mr. Burns stated the homeowner did not have an issue matching the windows to the home.
- Commissioner Thurston asked about the design of the door on the ADU. Mr. Burns explained the proposed door was a Craftsman style with two recessed panels and a top window. She noted that this design was not shown on the submitted drawings.
- Commissioners requested the applicant amend his request for the approval of the ADU without the windows or doors. This would allow the applicant time to revise the proposed windows and doors and then return to the Commission with more appropriate designs without delaying construction. Mr. Burns agreed to the amendment of his COA request

and stated he would return next month with different window and door styles proposed for the ADU.

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to amend as submitted except for the doors and windows;
Second by Commissioner Heiser.

The motion was amended with a vote of 6-0.

The amended motion was approved with a vote of 6-0.

*

6. (HD 25-20) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUEST FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 510 SHAWNEE STREET FOR THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: A) REMOVAL OF A NON-ORIGINAL REAR ADDITION; B) INSTALLATION OF A TWO-STORY ADDITION WITH A DECK.

Anais Starr presented the staff report:

- Ms. Starr stated the structure is a 1937 Colonial revival home which is contributing to the Southridge Historic District.
- Ms. Starr explained in July of 2019, the applicant received approval for an addition although at that time was unable to proceed with the addition due to the Covid Pandemic. Ms. Starr further explained that the applicant was returning to request the removal of the deteriorating non-original addition located at the rear of the house.
- Ms. Starr stated the applicant is proposing 599 square feet for each floor of the two-story addition for a total square footage of 1,198 square feet.
- Ms. Starr explained the applicant was lacking the required support documents necessary for approval by the Commission. However, Ms. Starr explained it would be beneficial for the Commission to provide feedback on the proposed addition.
- Ms. Starr explained the pressure treated wood deck is compatible with the neighborhood and meets the Preservation Guidelines.
- Ms. Staff further stated the proposed second story addition exceeds the allowed height of the structure as listed in the Preservation Guidelines, because it would be taller than the original home and would be clearly visible from the front streetscape.

Travis Kanard, the applicant, presented the item:

- Mr. Kanard explained the current height of his home was 17' 10", and the height of the proposed addition is 22'.
- Commissioner Halford asked Mr. Kanard if he had looked at alternative configurations for the addition. Mr. Kanard stated he was open to alternative configurations; however, he wanted to maximize the square footage.

- Commissioner Zorba inquired about the window material. Mr. Kanard stated he is willing to use aluminum wood clad windows or wood windows.
- Commissioner Thurston asked for the height of the walls in the proposed structure since the overall height of the addition will be 22'. Mr. Kanard answered that his previous contractor stated the addition would have 8-foot ceilings. He further stated he believed he could shave off about a foot from the overall height.
- Commissioner Dysart expressed her concern about the addition's height as well, because the Preservation Guidelines stated an addition's height is not to exceed the height of the original structure.
- Commissioner Halford stated a possible different configuration would be extending the addition straight from the back of the house. The applicant was receptive to this possibility if the configuration would fit his yard.

Motion by Commissioner Heiser to approve item (HD 25-20) Item A removal of a non-original rear addition as submitted; **Second** by Commissioner Brewer.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- The Commissioners agreed they could support the approval of Item A, removal of a non-original rear addition, due to its deteriorating state.

The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to approve item (HD 25-20) Item B installation of a two-story addition with a deck as submitted; **Second** by Commissioner Brewer.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Zorba stated the Commission needed more details regarding Item B such as elevation drawings, and spec sheets, before they would be able to approve it.
- Commissioner Halford stated it would be helpful for the applicant to present a couple of different options for Item B.
- Commissioners Brewer and Thurston stated pictures of the structure, and pictures of the addition tied into the existing structure would be helpful as well.

Motion by Commissioner Thurston to postpone item (HD 25-20) Item B, installation of a two-story addition with a deck, to a future Commission meeting; **Second** by Commissioner Brewer.

The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

7. (HD 25-21) CONSIDERATION OF FEEDBACK FOR REQUESTS FOR EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 485 COLLEGE AVENUE.

Anais Starr presented the staff report:

- Ms. Starr explained the property owner came before the Commission in June of 2024 requesting several exterior modifications. At that time the Commission found the proposed front elevation alterations to the house and the accessory structure did not meet the Guidelines and the items were postponed.
- Ms. Starr explained the swimming pool and the decking were postponed because the site plan did not clearly show its placement in the side yard.
- Ms. Starr also stated the Commission denied the request to install front façade dormers because they did not meet the Preservation Guidelines.
- Ms. Starr further explained the property owner, Stephen Teel, hired Krittenbrink Architecture to revisit the proposed exterior modifications, and he was seeking feedback from the Commission on those modifications.

Mark Krittenbrink, representing the applicant, presented the item:

- Mr. Krittenbrink stated they intended to restore the entire exterior of the house including the traditional details of the trim around the windows. He further explained the plan was to install the previously approved windows and restore the wood siding on the house and accessory structure.
- Mr. Krittenbrink stated outside the renovation of the exterior, they are proposing several modifications including a simple roof structure on the front entryway, an 8' by 12' covered rear porch, the removal of the window directly adjacent to the wall on the front wing of the addition of the house, the reconfiguring of windows and doors on the house and the accessory structure, and the installation of fences for the front and side yards.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion:

- Commissioner Halford stated the windows on the accessory structure must be centered.
- Mr. Krittenbrink asked the Commissioners for their feedback on removing the door on the accessory structure. He further stated the windows would remain. The Commissioners stated since this was a non-contributing structure, that the Guidelines supported the alteration.
- Commissioner Thurston asked what material would be used for the siding. Mr. Krittenbrink stated Hardie Siding with a width to match the house siding.

- The Commissioners indicated to Mr. Krittenbrink the proposed 8' metal fence on the north side of the house would not be approvable as the Guidelines did not support metal fences. Further there were previous protests from neighbors.

*

REPORTS/UPDATES

8. STAFF REPORT ON ACTIVE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE BYPASS ISSUED SINCE JUNE 2, 2025, AND CONSIDERATION OF SIX-MONTH EXTENSION REQUESTS FOR EXPIRING COAS.

Motion by Commissioner Brewer to approve a six-month extension request for the expiring Certificate of Appropriateness at 485 College Avenue; **Second** by Commissioner Thurston.

The motion was passed unanimously with a vote of 6-0.

Ms. Starr reported on active COAs as follows:

- 549 S. Lahoma Avenue - Applicant is in the process of submitting a COA request for the north windows.
 - 904 Classen Avenue - Applicant is in the process of installing windows and siding on the north side of the house.
 - 607-609 S. Lahoma Avenue - Contractor has rebuilt the upper sash for the two front windows and had planned installation for June 13; due to inclement weather the contractor has rescheduled installation of the front windows to July 18, 2025.
 - 1320 Oklahoma Avenue - Demolition not completed. New construction has not started. Code enforcement action is underway on the property.
 - 505 Chautauqua Avenue - Work continues.
 - 643 Okmulgee Street - Work on the house is complete. Expansion of the driveway with an additional parking space has not started.
 - 700 Chautauqua Avenue - Work has started.
 - 424 College Avenue - Work has not started.
 - 503 Shawnee Street - Work already installed. Building & paving permits have not been submitted. COA work is complete.
 - 538 Chautauqua Avenue - Work has not started.
 - 800 Miller Avenue - Work has not started.
9. DISCUSSION OF PROGRESS REPORT REGARDING FYE 2025-2026 CLG GRANT PROJECTS.
 - CLG grant funds are not available at this time but may be available later this year.

*

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

- Commissioner Chair Zorba announced tonight's meeting would be Commissioner Brewer's last Historic District meeting. He thanked her for her volunteerism and time on the Commission.

- Commissioner Halford informed the Commission that his last Historic District meeting will be in September.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 P.M.

Passed and approved this _____ day of _____ 2025.
