

**From:** [Friddle, Kathryn M](#)  
**To:** [Daniels, Keith](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on HPCA-24-00125 at 408 NW 30th  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 3, 2024 1:17:05 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

Comments for HPCA-24-00125.

---

**From:** Jann Hook [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 3, 2024 1:11 PM  
**To:** Friddle, Kathryn M <kathryn.friddle@okc.gov>; Yetter, Angela D <angela.yetter@okc.gov>  
**Subject:** Comments on HPCA-24-00125 at 408 NW 30th

**WARNING:** The sender of this email could not be validated and may not match the person in the "From" field..

Katie and Angela,

Please share our comments regarding the above application with HP Commissioners for tomorrow's meeting. Thank you.

Historic Preservation Commissioners and Staff—

We regret we are out of town and can't attend personally. We are not protesting the apartment project, but we are the homeowners directly across the street to the north and would like these structures to be something we don't mind having next door. While we appreciate the architect's efforts to incorporate comments and concerns of the neighborhoods, we believe there is still some room for improvement. Naturally we are concerned at how the noise, congestion and view will affect us personally, but we are also considering compatibility with the neighborhoods and existing structures. Adherence to the HP Guidelines is also of utmost importance just as residents are required to do.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Below are our specific comments on the application.

Jann and Terry Hook  
3101 N Harvey Parkway  
Edgemere Park

**HPCA-24-00125 at 408 NW 30th**

**Size/massing** – Included as a provision of SPUD-01581, the building size is subject to Historic Preservation review and approval. While reducing the overall size would be necessary for it to be compatible with the surrounding structures (as shown in the aerial photo with the project superimposed), some modulation of the facades to break them up could contribute to reducing a monolithic appearance. The front façade of each building is roughly 50', side facades are 64' and back facades are 60' --- significantly greater than surrounding structures. As noted several times in the Staff Report, "the proposed development deviates from the character of the block and surrounding area in its width and horizontality." Historic structures would typically have portions of a façade brought forward or back for visual interest and to reduce the mass. We believe it could do the same for this project making it more compatible with the structures on the surrounding blocks.

**Exterior materials at back façade** -- The rear façade is highly visible from the public right of way along Hudson. Use of brick on all other exterior facades while using only siding on the entire south facade makes this back façade look like an entirely different building. In all examples of structures provided by Mr. Lanman on the Historic District Pattern sheet of the submitted documents, none of the structures change materials on the back of the building. A change of materials not only cheapens the development and prevents it from having a cohesive appearance, it is not consistent with historic structures in the districts. During a Zoom presentation of the project, Mr. Lanman stated the project budget was in good shape and they were looking at additional things they could add, so perhaps adding some brick on the rear facade would be an option.

**Windows** –Fiberglass windows are not supported in the Guidelines and we are concerned about the profile not matching wood windows and color fading over time. Approving these could set a precedent.

**Door materials** – Three different materials for the exterior entry doors (wood,

fiberglass and metal) are proposed depending on the location. We have been unable to find support for metal doors in the Guidelines even if the doors are not visible from the public right of way, and believe they should not be allowed. No specifications are provided for the metal doors.

**Parking canopy** – Typically carports have not been allowed in historic districts. The proposed parking canopies are expanded carports and should not be allowed either, especially with the metal roof specified. The parking canopies will be several feet higher than the fence and gate and These structures will have an adverse effect on the surrounding properties and districts.

From the Guidelines:

*3.7.15: Metal roofs were not widely used in Oklahoma City historic districts and their installation is not appropriate unless it can be historically documented at a given building. New metal roofs shall match the details of the historic metal roof they replace.*

**AC Units on roof** - We understand that the AC units will not be visible from street level, but there is concern that the units may be visible over the parapet from the second story of adjacent residences which are on higher ground than the proposed project. Could that be determined definitively? Since there will be 18 units on the roof, we would appreciate knowing what the noise level will be when all are running at the same time. This could impact residents.

### **Design suggestions**

The rendering Mr. Lanman showed on a Zoom presentation had a circle opening in the entry way. That version is preferred over the arched entry as the circle gives it a little Art Deco look and relates to the brickwork more than the arches.

The structures would look better in a darker brick. We believe it would minimize

the massing and be more compatible with surrounding structures.

**Other**

No specifications are provided for the down lights on second floor in courtyard area.