HYBRID SPECIAL MEETING AMENDED AGENDA

This hybrid special board meeting is being held consistent with the amendments to the Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 2011, § 301 et seq, signed into law by Governor Stitt on Wednesday, February 10, 2021, SB1031, 2021 O.S.L. 1, § 1

Public link to access meeting:
https://omes.webex.com/omes/onstage/g.php?MTID=e7da3d298220a41c0a1d5cdc871e5ea27
Call-in information: +1-415-655-0001; Show all global call-in numbers
Access code: 187 738 1626

The notice of this hybrid special board meeting was filed with the Secretary of State’s Office on April 29, 2021. Notice/final agenda was posted on May 3, 2021, at 4:00 p.m. on the OMES/Capitol-Medical Center Improvement and Zoning Commission website and at the West entrance of the Will Rogers Building, 2401 N. Lincoln Blvd., Oklahoma City, OK 73105.

https://www.sos.ok.gov/meetings/notices/002357/0526002104291155.htm

The Board may discuss, vote to approve, vote to disapprove, vote to table, change the sequence of any agenda item, or vote to strike or not discuss any agenda item.

The following Commission Members have the option to participate in person or remotely using the WebEx videoconference platform:

- Mike Mays, Architect [appearing remotely]
- Susan McCalmont, Chairman designee of the Historical Preservation and Landmark Commission of the City of Oklahoma City [appearing remotely]
- Carla Splaingard, Real Estate Broker [appearing remotely]
- Laura Stone, Resident who owns property located in a designated Historic Preservation District within the Capitol-Medical Center Improvement and Zoning District [appearing remotely]
- Kassy Malone, City Planner/Landscape Architect [appearing remotely]
- Joshua Greenhaw, Attorney [appearing remotely]
• Camal Pennington, Resident who owns property located in a designated Historic Preservation District within the Capitol-Medical Center Improvement and Zoning District [appearing remotely]
• Janis Powers, Capitol-Medical Center Improvement and Zoning Commission ex-officio member [appearing remotely]

If any of the above-listed Board members loses videoconference communication during the meeting, he or she will attempt to rejoin and participate by teleconference. In the event electronic communications are lost or compromised during the meeting, the Historical Preservation and Landmark Board of Review staff will attempt to restore communications for a maximum of (15) fifteen minutes. If unable to restore communications the meeting will be adjourned.

A. Roll Call

B. Minutes:
   1. Approval, disapproval or amendment of the minutes of the April 1, 2021 hybrid special meeting.

C. Special Public Hearings: None.

D. Rezoning Requests: None.

E. Certificates of Appropriateness:
   1. Discussion and possible action regarding CA-20-21-31, request by Kerstin and Michael Reinschmidt for a certificate of appropriateness for exterior work at 725-727 NE 14th Street in the Lincoln Terrace East Historic District of Oklahoma City:
      a. Item 1, demolition of a 485-square-foot detached garage/storage building.
      b. Item 2, construction of a 625-square-foot detached garage.

F. Miscellaneous: None.

G. Reports and Communications: None.

H. Adjournment

Materials provided to members of the Board or shared electronically between members of the Board may be accessed here:

Next meeting: Thursday, June 3, 2021 at 4:00 p.m.
Minutes
Historical Preservation and Landmark Board of Review
Hybrid Special Meeting
Will Rogers Building
CR – 214 (Innovation) /216 (Create)
2401 N. Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, OK 73105
Apr. 1, 2021, 4:00 p.m.
WebEx Platform
UNOFFICIAL

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Kassy Malone
Mike Mays
Susan McCalmont
Janis Powers
Dr. Andreana Prichard
Laura Stone

MEMBERS ABSENT:  Josh Greenhaw
Carla Splaingard

STAFF/GUESTS:  Casey Jones, AICP, OMES, Planner
Beverly Hicks, OMES, Planning/Administrative Coordinator
Spencer Wilson, Fitzsimmons Architects
Brian Fitzsimmons, Fitzsimmons Architects

A. Roll Call:
Chairwoman, Laura Stone called this hybrid special meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was established. Ms. Stone was advised that notice of the meeting had been given and an agenda posted in accordance with the Open Meeting Act.

B. Minutes:
1. Approval, disapproval or amendment of the minutes of the March 4, 2020, virtual special meeting:

Susan McCalmont moved to approve the special meeting minutes of March. Mike Mays seconded the motion. The following votes were recorded and the motion passed:

Ms. Malone, yes; Mr. Mays, yes; Ms. McCalmont, yes; Ms. Powers, yes; Dr. Prichard, yes; Ms. Stone, yes.

C. Special Public Hearings:  None.
D. Rezoning Requests:  None.

E. Certificates of Appropriateness:
1. **Discussion and possible action regarding CA-20-21-30, request by Spencer Wilson, Fitzsimmons Architects, representing 701 Culbertson LP, the owner, for a certificate of appropriateness for exterior site improvements at 727 Culbertson Drive in the Lincoln Terrace East Historic District of Oklahoma City:**

Mr. Jones made known that the signage listed in the scope of work has been omitted at the request of the applicant and is excluded from consideration at this time.

The applicant proposes the following:
- Install a rolling traffic gate
- Dumpster enclosure
- Screening vegetation
- Trees
- Landscaping and planting
- Replacement driveway curbs
- Resurfacing the asphalt driveway
- Plantings / ground cover
- Repairing the masonry wall in front of the building
- Repairing degraded concrete curb cuts
- Reconfiguring concrete paths in the front courtyard
- Install granite screening around the proposed patio
- Install a new courtyard patio consisting of a concrete pad and gravel screening and planting.
- Install a gas grill
- Install a masonry retaining wall along the front right of way line
- Relocate exterior mailboxes to the interior of the building
- Possibly extending the public sidewalk around to the Southside of the property; currently the sidewalk is only located on the eastside of the property and abruptly ends.
- Adding some decorative up lighting and updating some of the parking lot lighting.

Staff recommended to approve the certificate of appropriateness for specified exterior site improvements, excluding signs, with the following findings and conditions:

**Findings:**
- a. The proposed work will not adversely affect the integrity and historic character of the district or the property.
- b. The proposed work is compatible with the design of the existing building.
- c. The proposed work will not damage any historic building materials or character-defining features.
- d. The proposed work, if removed in the future, would not impair the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment.

**Conditions:**
a. All exterior work shall conform to the approved plans. Any proposed changes must be submitted to commission staff for review and approval prior to making changes on site.
b. New concrete shall not be bright white in color and should match the color of adjacent concrete.
c. A building permit shall be obtained from the Commission’s office prior to the commencement of work.

Janis Powers moved to approve specified exterior site work and to extend the sidewalk on to the Westside. Mike Mays seconded the motion. The following votes were recorded and the motion passed:

Ms. Malone, yes; Mr. Mays, yes; Ms. McCalmont, yes; Ms. Powers, yes; Dr. Prichard, yes; Ms. Stone, yes.

2. Discussion and possible action regarding CA-20-21-25, request by the City of Oklahoma City for a certificate of appropriateness for demolition of a detached garage located at 410 NE 16th Street in the Wilson-Harn Historic District of Oklahoma City.

Update: This request was withdrawn by the applicant on March 26, 2021. No action required.

The City of Oklahoma City on March 26th advised staff that they request to withdraw their application for demolition. Therefore, no action is required by the Board.

Mr. Jones reported that the owner of the property who he has been in contact with has been making repairs and on March 23rd when he went by the property the garage was standing upright and appeared to be stable.

The City’s staff advised that they are not intending to proactively issue any citations at this time and they are giving the owner the opportunity to continue with the repair work as needed.

Report only. No action taken.

F. Miscellaneous: None.

G. Reports and Communications: Report on board vacancy.

Mr. Jones reported that staff has received letters of interest for the resident vacancy from three different people who live and own homes in the Lincoln Terrace neighborhood in the historic district. One of them will be nominated by Chairman Dan Ross at the April 23, 2021, Capitol-Medical Center Improvement and Zoning Commission meeting and appointed to the Board.

H. Adjournment:
There being no further business, Susan McCalmont motioned to adjourn. Mike Mays seconded the motion. Seeing no opposition, the meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.
Case Number: CA-20-21-31

Property Address: 725-727 NE 14th Street

Legal Description: Lot 18, Block 5, Howe’s Capitol Addition to Oklahoma City

Owner/Applicant: Kerstin and Michael Reinschmidt

Items for Consideration:

1. Demolish the existing 485-square-foot detached garage/storage building.
2. Construct a 625-square-foot detached garage.

Background:
1. Zoning designation: RD-2, Low Density General Residential District and HP, Historic Preservation District
3. Existing use: Two family dwelling
4. Lot size: approximately 7,350 square feet or 0.17 acres (50’ x 147)
5. Applicant acquired the property in 2017
6. Date of construction: 1928; Contributing structure to the Lincoln Terrace East Historic District

Issues and Considerations:

1. **Item 1, demolition of the existing 485-square-foot detached garage/storage building.**
   Proposal: The applicant proposes to demolish the existing, 485-square-foot (roughly 22’ x 23’) detached garage/storage building located at the rear of the lot due to its deteriorated condition and structural damage as evidenced by the provided photographs and description. The existing structure is not in good enough condition for it to feasibly be repaired and rehabilitated.

   The existing garage is a one-story, slab-on-grade, wood frame structure with wood lap siding on the exterior walls, composite 3-tab shingles on the roof, and plywood doors. The windows are missing and boarded up. The applicant has provided the attached annotated photographs of the exterior and interior of the structure showing its existing condition.

   Considerations: In regard to demolition, the commission’s Administrative Rules, OAC Title 120, Chapter 10-11-9.1(d), state:

   Demolitions. No structure or site within any HL, Historical Landmark or HP, Historic Preservation District shall be demolished or removed unless such demolition shall be...
approved by the Board and a Certificate of Appropriateness for such demolitions shall be granted. Applications for demolition permits shall be filed with the Commission.

The Board shall be guided by the following criteria in considering Certificates of Appropriateness and authorization for demolition of structures or sites within the HL, Historical Landmark or the HP, Historic Preservation District, to-wit:

(1) The purpose and intent of this Subchapter.
(2) The degree to which the proposed removal of the historical resource would serve to destroy the integrity and continuity of the Historical Landmark or Historic Preservation District of which it is a part.
(3) The nature of the resource as a representative type of style of architecture, socio-economic development, historical association or other elements of the original designation criteria applicable to such structure or site.
(4) The condition of the resource from the standpoint of structural integrity and the extent of work necessary to stabilize the structure.
(5) The alternative available to the demolition applicant, including:
   (A) Donation of the subject structure or site to a public or benevolent agency.
   (B) Donation of a part of the value of the subject structure or site to a public or benevolent agency including the conveyance of development rights and facade easement.
   (C) The possibility of sale of the structure or site, or any parts thereof, to a prospective purchaser capable of preserving such structure or site.
   (D) The potential of such structure or site for renovation and its potential for continuing use.
   (E) The potential of the subject structure or site for rezoning in an effort to render such property more compatible with the physical potential of the structure.
(6) The ability of the subject structure or site to produce a reasonable economic return on investment to its owner; provided however, that it is specifically intended that this factor shall be considered along with all other criteria contained in this Section.
2. **Item 2, construction of a 625-square-foot detached garage.**

Proposal: The applicant proposes to construct a one-story detached garage with a footprint of 625 square feet (proposed dimensions are 25’ x 25’). Plans for the garage are provided in the attached application and scope of work. The garage is intended to provide adequate parking and storage for the two dwelling units on the property.

The proposed garage would be constructed on a new concrete slab foundation with a finished floor height five inches higher than the existing garage floor to prevent storm water from entering the structure. The south and east walls of the garage would be built with the same setbacks as those of the existing garage. The east wall is only about 20 inches from the side property line, and it encroaches into the 5-foot side yard setback area, so the applicant has applied for a setback variance to allow the new garage to match the historical setback. The Commission will hold a public hearing to consider the demolition permit and setback variance request at its May 28, 2021 meeting. The owners of all parcels within 300 feet have been notified of the public hearing and given the opportunity to provide comment.

Roof: The garage would have a hipped roof with a one-foot overhang on all sides. The roof covering would be composite architectural shingles in a dark grey color to match the shingles that were recently installed on the home. The roof would have a 6” over 12” pitch. The ridgeline of the roof would be between 13 feet...
and 14 feet in height. Rain gutters matching the gutters on the home would be installed on all four elevations, and water would drain to a single downspout located at the northwest corner of the garage.

Walls: The exterior walls would be finished with horizontal 8-inch smooth lap fiber cement board siding with 6-inch reveal.

Windows: No windows are proposed other than the windows incorporated into the overhead door.

Doors: The applicant proposes to install a smooth wood entry door on the south (front) elevation of the garage, and this door would not be visible from the street. For vehicle access, the applicant proposes to install a 16-feet-wide by 7-feet-high, smooth fiberglass or composite wood, paneled overhead door with one row of windows on the south (front) elevation of the garage. The right-hand side of the overhead door would be partially visible from the street. Staff has advised the applicant that two single-car doors are recommended by the standards and guidelines even though the front façade of the garage will be mostly obscured from public view. The applicant requests the 16-foot door to allow for easier maneuvering of vehicles while having to turn in a rather tight space.

Setbacks, Coverage and Open Space: The recorded plat of Howe’s Capitol Addition establishes a 5-foot utility easement along the rear (north) lot line. The zoning rules require detached garages to be located behind the rear wall of the home and 5 feet from side lot lines. The garage is proposed to be set back 6 feet from the north (rear) property line, 20 inches from the east property line, and 26 feet from the west property line. The proposed placement of the garage is similar to other garages in the district, but the proposed side yard setback of 20 inches is not in compliance with the 5-foot minimum side yard rule. To locate the new garage on the same line as the original garage, the applicant has applied for a setback variance. The garage will comply with applicable lot coverage and open space requirements.

**Considerations:**

In regard to garages, the *Historic Preservation Standards and Guidelines* state:

**POLICY:** The retention of existing, historic garages is encouraged. A historic garage should be refurbished and modified instead of demolished or replaced to accommodate contemporary lifestyle requirements. New garages are permitted where a house does not have a garage or where a new garage is necessary. As with other accessory buildings, garages should have their own form and should generally appear as secondary structures and not visually overwhelm or compete with the other historic buildings of the property or district.

**DESIGN JUSTIFICATION:** The way in which existing and new buildings relate is important in maintaining the overall historic character of a historic property and district. Architectural design directly affects the integrity of the property and district as a whole. For this reason, new, stand-alone buildings should maintain the continuity of the character of a historic property and district.

**4.4.3:** Construction of a new or replacement garage should follow the historic setback for a garage on the property or setback patterns of other garages in the streetscape or historic district.
4.4.4: Historic garages in Oklahoma City’s historic districts are predominantly detached, and attached garages are not appropriate unless documentation demonstrates their previous historic existence at the property.
4.4.5: Construction of a replacement garage should approximate the original configuration, form, massing, style, placement and detail of the former garage as described by photographic or other documentation.
4.4.6: Construction of a replacement garage may reasonably expand beyond the footprint of a historic one- or two-car garage, up to a total footprint of 450 square feet or 5 percent of the lot, whichever is greater, in order to accommodate a standard size parking space for up to two vehicles. Additional factors including the level of visibility of a new garage and the size and massing of surrounding structures may be considered.
4.4.7: Design a new garage to be secondary to that of a property’s main historic building.
4.4.8: When no photographic or other documentation of a previous garage is available, a new garage should be compatible in size, scale, proportion, spacing, texture, setbacks, height, materials, color and detail to the primary building and should relate to similar garages within the historic district, as appropriate.
4.4.9: Materials used for a new garage should reflect the property’s historical development and the use and function of the garage. Materials used for the exterior façades of a garage were often different (and less costly) than those used for the primary building.
4.4.10: A garage may be of modest or high-style design to complement a property’s historical development. Often, a new garage should be modest with a simple rectangular plan and form and a low-pitched, gabled or hipped roof. Doors and windows may have little or no ornamentation.
4.4.11: When no photographic or other documentation is available, a new one-story garage should be similar in height to other similar, historic one-story garages in the streetscape and historic district. A new two-story garage should be similar in height to the historic two-story garages of adjacent properties, in the streetscape and of the historic district.
4.4.12: When no photographic or other documentation of a previous historic garage is available, a replacement garage may be two stories tall when the original or historic garage was two stories, or if located in a block where two-story or one and a half story garages are dominant or occur on abutting property. New garages in blocks that contain only one-story garages shall be one-story.
4.4.13: In locations where two-story garages are not allowed, a garage may be one and a half stories as defined in the Municipal Code so long as its design and height approximate the massing of a previous historic garage at the property, or adjacent one-story garages if no documentation of a previous historic garage is available.

GARAGE DOORS, OPENINGS AND DOORS
4.4.14: Spacing and size of window and door openings in a new garage should be consistent with the historical development of the property and similar to their historic counterparts within the streetscape or historic district, as should the proportion of window to wall space.
4.4.15: New garage pedestrian doors may be solid wood with wood frames or alternate door and door frame materials such as composite wood or aluminum clad wood for locations that are not visible from the public right-of-way. Otherwise pedestrian doors and frames shall be solid wood.
4.4.16: New garage vehicle doors may be solid wood, wood veneer with a concealed metal frame, or composite materials including fiberglass or wood fiber (85 percent minimum wood fiber content). Doors should first match the historic design. When the historic design is unknown then the doors should match the design of other historic garage doors used in the respective district. A paneled design may be appropriate.
4.4.17: At double garages, two single garage vehicle doors should be used instead of one larger, double door. This will maintain the scale and rhythm of older structures, making a two-car garage seem smaller and more compatible with the primary building and the district.

4.4.18: If a historic garage is to be demolished to allow the construction of a new garage, it is encouraged that the historic doors be salvaged and re-used at the new garage, or if this is not possible, that the historic garage doors be replicated in the new garage design.

4.4.19: Doors at new high style garages should complement the garage in design and materials. The use of paneled wood garage doors or custom garage doors is encouraged at these locations.

In regard to **exterior materials for new construction**, the *Historic Preservation Standards and Guidelines* state:

**POLICY:** Materials used in the construction of new buildings, additions, garages and other accessory buildings should be compatible in appearance and design with common building materials in the district, or typical of structures of the proposed style, type, age and location.

**DESIGN JUSTIFICATION:** The form, materials and details of exterior walls and embellishments, as well as their scale, texture and variety, contribute to the overall character of the historic district.

**WALL MATERIALS**

4.6.2: Materials for new construction should be consistent with those at other buildings within the property, block and historic district. Consideration should be given to the pattern of development of the specific property and lot.

4.6.3: Wood siding may be tongue and groove, shiplap, novelty or other compatible type. Board and batten may also be appropriate for use on accessory buildings; it is rarely used on primary buildings.

4.6.4: Brick is a common material in the historic districts and is appropriate for use on new construction.

4.6.5: Stone is an appropriate material that can be incorporated into new construction.

4.6.6: Cementitious siding (smooth finish) of an appropriate profile may be used at new construction of stand-alone primary buildings, garages and other accessory buildings. It may also be used for additions to historic structures.

4.6.7: Exterior insulation finish systems (also known as EIFS or Dryvit), metal and vinyl siding, concrete block, imitative brick or stone or gravel aggregate materials are not permitted as wall materials. However, ornamental, rock-faced, mold-formed or rusticated concrete block may be used for foundation walls if previously used for other buildings on the property or in the district.

4.6.8: Stone patterns, sizes and color of individual stones should be similar to those found at the property or in historic buildings in the historic district and typical of structures of the same style, type, age and location.

4.6.9: Masonry bonding patterns, sizes and color should be similar to those found at the property or used for historic buildings in the historic district and typical of structures of the same style, type, age and location.

**WINDOWS**

4.6.10: Windows in additions to existing buildings must match or complement the proportion, shape, pattern, size, details and profile of the windows in the historic building. If the historic or existing windows are wood, the windows of the addition may be wood, vinyl-clad wood or aluminum-clad wood. If the historic windows or existing are steel, the windows of the addition should be steel or other compatible metal. All windows in new additions should be of a profile similar to the windows in the historic building.
4.6.11: Windows in new stand-alone construction must be similar to their counterparts within the property, block or historic district. These windows may be wood, vinyl clad wood, metal clad wood, or metal with a profile similar to the windows of other buildings on the property. For new infill construction the profile must be similar to the windows used on other properties in the block or historic district.

4.6.12: New windows may have a simpler window pane pattern than their historic counterparts; for example, if the historic windows are 6/1 (read “six over one”), then 1/1 windows of the same overall size may be used.

4.6.13: Windows constructed entirely of aluminum or vinyl are not permitted, and aluminum surfaces cannot have a clear, mill or anodized finish unless supported by historic documentation for a specific property or structure.

4.6.14: Clear glass must be used in all windows. Reflective, tinted, patterned or sandblasted glass in windows is generally not appropriate. Patterned, leaded or colored glass can be used in transoms and sidelights when established by the architectural style of the building or when supported by historical documentation for a specific property or structure.

4.6.15: Thermal pane (also known as insulated glass) windows are acceptable for additions or new construction. When muntins are proposed for a divided light appearance they should be “true divided lights” meaning that the thin wood framing (called muntins) completely frames and separates each piece of glass from the others.

4.6.16: Simulated muntins sandwiched between layers of glass in thermal windows, snap-on muntins, and surface-applied muntins may not be used except when internal muntins are used in conjunction with permanently fixed surface-applied muntins on the interior and the exterior of the glass.

4.6.17: Security bars may be used only on the interior side of windows and not sandwiched in between the layers of insulated glass.

4.6.18: Storm windows and window screens are permitted and should meet the recommendations and requirements of the applicable sections in the “Alterations to the Building Fabric and Components of Historic Buildings” chapter.

DOORS

4.6.19: Recommendations and requirements for garage type doors are described in the “Garage” section of this chapter.

4.6.20: Recommendations and requirements for primary entrance doors, screen doors and storm doors, and doors that are visible from the public right-of-way are the same as described for the “Alterations to the Building Fabric and Components of Historic Buildings” chapter.

4.6.21: Swinging (French) or sliding patio doors used for new construction in the back of a new infill primary building, or new garages, accessory buildings, or new additions in the back yard and used in conjunction with sidelights may use the recommendations and requirements associated with the previous subsection of this section, “Windows,” provided that the patio doors and sidelights will match.

4.6.22: Pedestrian doors that are not visible from the public right-of-way may be made of alternate materials including aluminum clad wood, composite wood and fiberglass.

ROOF AND ROOFING MATERIALS

4.6.23: Wood shingles, composition shingles, slate tiles, terra cotta or clay tiles are permitted for use on roofs. Recommendations and requirements for these materials are found in the “Alterations to the Building Fabric and Components of Historic Buildings” chapter.
4.6.24: Metal roofs are permitted only as supported by historical documentation of such material for the property.

4.6.25: Synthetic slate and clay tiles may be able to be used if the appearance matches authentic slate and clay tiles in all aspects. These materials may be considered on a case by case basis.

4.6.26: Composition roofs should be of higher quality and are often referred to as Architectural Grade or Dimensional Grade. These shingles are usually rated as 30-, 40-, or 50-year shingles and have a thicker profile.

4.6.27: Built-up roofs, single-ply membranes should not be used on sloped roofs.

4.6.28: Multi-colored asphalt shingles and synthetic wood shingles should not be used on sloped roofs.

4.6.29: Historic eaves, copings, cornices, dormers and roof trim should be retained and preserved.

The complete Historic Preservation Standards and Guidelines, including the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, are available for reference on the Commission’s website.

When reviewing this proposal, the Board must consider if the proposed improvements would be compatible with the property’s character and setting and if the work would damage the character of the property or the Lincoln Terrace East Historic District.

Staff Recommendation:

Approve CA-20-21-31, Item 1, request for a certificate of appropriateness for demolition of the existing 485-square-foot detached garage/storage building, with the following findings and conditions:

Findings:
   a. The structure is in a state of disrepair, much of its historic materials appear to be damaged beyond repair, and extensive work would be necessary to stabilize and rehabilitate the structure.
   b. While demolition would damage the integrity and continuity of the district, repairing the structure would result in the loss of its remaining historic fabric.

Conditions:
   a. Building permits shall be obtained from the Commission’s Office and from the City of Oklahoma City Development Services Department prior to the commencement of work.

Approve CA-20-21-31, Item 2, request for a certificate of appropriateness for construction of a 625-square-foot detached garage, with the following findings and conditions:

Findings:
   a. The proposed garage is compatible with the existing home and will not adversely affect the integrity and historic character of the district or the property.
   b. The location, building footprint, scale, orientation, design and exterior materials of the proposed garage are compatible with the property’s setting and with buildings on surrounding properties.

Conditions:
   a. A side yard setback variance shall be obtained from the Commission.
   b. Two single-car overhead doors shall be provided instead of a double-car door. (Revised elevation drawing and door product specifications are required.)
c. All exterior work shall conform to the approved plans. Any proposed changes must be submitted to commission staff for review and approval prior to making changes on site.

d. A building permit shall be obtained from the Commission’s Office and from the City of Oklahoma City Development Services Department prior to the commencement of work.

Alternatives:

The Board may approve in whole or in part, approve subject to revisions, table, or disapprove the request for a certificate of appropriateness.

Attachments:
Application and Supporting Documents
County Assessor Property Record Card
State of Oklahoma  
Capitol-Medical Center Improvement & Zoning Commission  
2401 North Lincoln Boulevard or P.O. Box 53448  
Oklahoma City, OK 73152-3448

Michael & Kerstin REINSCHMIDT  
727/725 Northeast 14th Street  
Lincoln Terrace-East Historical District  
Oklahoma City, OK 73104

Email: bak7si@live.com  
Cell: 520-237-2943

March 25, 2021

Dear Commission Board Members,  
or To Whom It May Concern,

The historic house property in Lincoln Terrace East Historic District with the address indicated above needs a new garage. After considering all options for historic preservation, we have come to the difficult decision to tear down the old and build a new garage. As work is schedule to start in April 2021, we would like to seek your approval as soon as possible. In the following I provide the required documents that you request according to your form “Certificate of Appropriateness” (Zoning – Form 002, 05/2018).

The documents your Commission requires include segments A, B, C, D, E, and F.

A. Scope of work – basic description: Old garage building depicted below to be tore down and new one erected in the same old spot on new concrete slab, just one foot wider and three foot longer (total of 25x25 ft.). Materials used – commonly available concrete, rebar, wood, steel anchors, fasteners, electrical installation materials, composite wood trim siding, composite shingles, aluminum gutters – all appropriately colored according to neighborhood tones; one downsout to be installed in hidden northwest corner of new structure.

B. Documentation of Existing Conditions – appearance, condition, and dimensions: please see photos on the following pages. Photo captions are always to be found underneath the images.
1) Front view (above) of garage shed in backyard of 727/725 NE 14th Street, Lincoln Terrace East Historical District, 73104. The curb on the right indicates the property line showing that this garage has been sitting there for the past 9 decades. Regarding variance: The 733 NE 14th building is exactly 6.5 feet away from our garage, whereas the garage is exactly 1 foot and 8 inches away from the property line adjacent to 733, here indicated by the curb line.

2) Back view of shed above at 727/725 NE 14th Street; the piles of bricks and blocks indicate some of the holes through which critters crawl in and out. Note the deteriorating roof.
3) Side view of shed (above), at 727/725 NE 14th Street. Note immediate proximity of the large building in the background (733 NE 14th St.). Regarding variance: As 733 is exactly 5 ft. away from its nearest property line adjacent to the north our new building would come out to the north by 3 feet, but still remain 5 feet away from our northerly neighbor's property line.

4) View onto fragmented roof frame of lean-to; note singed-off roof shingles, backyard of 727/725 NE 14th Street. We desperately need the storage space of this part of the garage.
5) Side/front view of structure, 727/725 NE 14th Street. Roof and siding deterioration in plain sight.

6) Left: Post supporting roof beam; this post prevents entire rear half of roof from collapsing. On the right one can see the frame in which the original motor for the automatic door was placed.
7) Five images above: Assortment of photos sampling the broken concrete slab. The level inconsistencies vary erratically from $\frac{1}{2}$ an inch to 1.5 inches; holes of various sizes reveal that the slab was just a shallow concrete pour with no rebarS in it.
8) and 9) Impact by old trees from above and below (images taken summer 2017), causing long-term harm to roof and slab; concrete platform has been entirely undermined by powerful root activity over past decades resulting in myriad broken slab pieces.

In sum: The two essential questions that we were asking ourselves are as follows. What is contributing more to our neighborhood’s historic preservation: a) the existing eyesore prone to further deterioration and ultimate collapse or b) a new modest garage that’s nicely integrating into its surroundings? In these application segments we hope to demonstrate this “nice integration” process with hopes strongly expressed for approval. Thank you.

Drawing – basic approximations of proposed project:

Basic drawing for gaining basic understanding of what will be built and how it will look.
C. Site Plans: all downloaded from Capitol-Medical Center Improvement and Zoning Commission website.

Above: Street view of 727/725 NE 14th in center and 733 NE 14th Street to the right:

Capitol-Medical Zoning

727/725 NE 14th Street lot in lower right-hand corner, second from right (above black arrow); the garage under review is the little (almost) square in upper right corner of lot. The main building on this lot is the 727/725 NE 14th St. Spanish Colonial style duplex.

The above and below site and parcel plans were downloaded from the Capitol-Medical Center Improvement and Zoning Commission website to show the exact dimensions for the existing garage, the existing home, the driveway, property lines, and the distances between buildings and adjacent property lines. Regarding variance, we have no plans to change the basic dimensions to deviate from the historic site plan.
727/725 NE 14th Street lot revealing bird's eye view of lot; red circle identifies the current, historic, garage site on which the new building is meant to be erected. Note that the west wall line of the 733 NE 14th building is extremely close to our property line, while our building is 1 foot and 8 inches away from that line.
D. Elevations, Floor, and Roof Plans:

**Drawings with Site Focus:** The **red line** specifies our plan to add three (3) feet to the back (or north) of the future building and one (1) foot to the left (or west). Thereby the vacant corner on the upper left side of the current structure would be subsumed into usable interior space. Due to frequent stormwater flooding into the garage in the past, the new concrete slab will be elevated by about five (5) inches. The one (1) foot addition to the west is necessary because of modern standard sizes for automatic double garage gates. The current gate width of 15 ft. at the old building would not be enough space to accommodate a new 16 ft.-wide double gate.

Moreover, the small storage room left of the currently very tight two-car shelter should not suffer loss of space because it is so small already. The current 15 ft. width for the old garage opening is therefore not according to modern gate standards offered at retail companies such as Home Depot.

The new standard double garage door planned to be installed measures 16 x 7 ft. (see below under F. Products, “doors”). So, this is the main reason why the new building should be one (1) foot wider than the old one. Moreover, the height of the current gate is only 6 ft 8 inches which is not enough to fit the new gate, which is why we would like to raise the height of the new building by one (1) foot. The extra height would not obstruct any views in this part of the neighborhood.

In order not to change size and location of the new building, it will be sitting approximately in the same spot as the existing decaying structure. Only a slight change has been envisioned as explained in the next paragraph.

If approved, the floor plan for the concrete foundation slab would thus measure 25 ft x 25 ft. (the old building is 24 ft wide to the west and 22 ft long to the north). It would be about 5 inches higher than the old slab. This perfect new quadrant would alleviate costs for lumber and complications of roof construction because the size acquits the roof from needing a ridge (see drawing “View from the Top” below). The overhang of the roof on all sides will be one (1) foot, which is the same for the current structure. The roof has no vents or chimneys. The new building will also not feature any windows, except for the ones built into the garage gate. As stated, it is planned to have the four walls of the new building raised by one (1) foot to better accommodate garage door installation, garage door operation via automatic lift, and to expand on needed space for more storage. Given
the stated compelling reasons, the approval of the new building size – specifically to accommodate the automatic double door – would be appreciated very much.

Front View Details (according to scale – one box equals one foot or 30.5 cm): side door, double garage door, roof area, and gutters. A dividing wall inside the building will extend from front to back right in between the side door on the left and the main gate to the right. An inside passage-way will connect the two spaces to be potentially lockable either by sliding door or a regular door (TBD). This room to the left of the parking space will provide additional storage for the duplex’s two resident parties. Note: the measure of 5 inches for slab height indicates the added elevation for the new slab. The regular depth of a decent slab of about a foot depth should be added as overall slab thickness to better accommodate rebar insertion and stormwater runoff. Note the historic distance between adjacent buildings 727 and 733 NE 14th street is only 6.5 feet, with our building 1 foot and 8 inches away from the eastern property line.

Miscellaneous: this project will NOT involve any changes or additions to driveways, sidewalks, fencing, fence walls, retaining walls, landscaping elements, decks, or sheds.
Side View – Basics (not acc. to scale): intended to provide rough depiction of horizontal siding pattern and roof shingles; boards will run undivided along side and rear walls.

View from the Top (not acc. to scale): allows basic understanding of rafter orientation plus how the four equal triangles ascend to the singular roof tip at a center elevation of about 4 feet.
E. **Construction Methods and Materials**: Regular methods of replacing old building with new include: 1) demolition of old slab and structure; 2) transporting debris to city landfill; 3) encasing and pouring slab with embedded rebar system ca. 5 inches higher than old slab (for better run off during stormwater onsloughts); 4) setting up wooden frame structure; and 5) topping it off with new rafters for shingled roof. The project will be completed with 6) horizontal wood planks fastened to exterior walls with plywood inwardly and straight boards on the outside measuring ca. 8 inches in width leaving them with approximately 6 inches of exposure; and 7) putting plywood coverage and composite roof shingles onto the rafter frame.

8) The new structure will be equipped with regular electrical fixtures for lamps, switches, a few interior outlets (TBD), plus one exterior yard lamp similar to the one you see in attached photos; this building will not have any water or sewer connections. 9) Four straight gutter lines around the roof will collect rainwater and direct it to one (1) downspout on the northwest corner of the building. Gutter materials will be the same as used on the roof of the 727-725 duplex (approved by your Commission in Nov. 2018). Ultimately, rainwater will be collected in a 55-gallon barrel (obtained through City’s recycling facility) to be used for growing fruit trees and raised-bed vegetables adjacent to the new garage. No brick laying or masonry will be required for this project unless the City’s building permit requires a firewall on the east side.

F. **Products**: Please see pricing and appearance of commercially available devices and materials in screenshots below.

**Doors:**

![Door Image]

*36 in. x 80 in. Fire Rated Gray Right-Hand Flush Steel Prehung Commercial Door with Welded Frame, Deadbolt and Hardware*

*4 Star Rating*

- Construction from Galvanized Steel for Optimal Fire Resistance
- Door and Frame Assembly Features a 90 Minute Fire Rating
- Recommended for New Construction
- Can Have Glass

$476.44

OR

$80.00 per month suggested payment with E-merchandising on the Home Depot Consumer Card

Common Door Size (Half) in: 36 x 80

- 36 x 80
- 36 x 84

Door Housing: Right-Handed

*Left Handed*  *Right Handed*

**Wooden Exterior Door**: Please note – this will be a wooden door (not steel as indicated in the screenshot)! This sample sized door for side entrance to storage room next to garage space will be bluish-gray matching main building colors. The image visible here is only for impressions.
Garage Double Gate (composite or fiberglass with smooth finish); final color will be a dark bluish-gray in synch with window paints on main house (see right image); note that window patterns of this garage gate match historic windows of main house and the gray bricks (right image).

Reasons for keeping a double door:
1. The costs for two narrow automatic doors are much higher than for one double door.
2. The original garage gate at some point had an automatic double door; we would like to encourage user/historic consistency here to keep optimizing an extremely tight space management (a two-door solution will take at least two feet away from maneuverability in an original 15 feet door opening width).
3. Two “narrow” doors would thus defy a hassle-free process of taking cars in and out.
4. The gate will be visible from the street by only about one third; that implies that from among two narrow doors, even the right one will not be fully visible; in other words, street appearance would be affected neither by a single door nor a double door, which can’t be determined by a casual passer-by.
5. The new double door will have an appealing new “oldish” look in historic tradition (note the little windows in the door’s upper field) thus proving support of historic preservation goals.
6. As we are all ageing, a double gate provides more safety than two “narrow” doors when parking in and out; we hope this argument will find serious consideration.
7. Along with safety, the backyard space between the main building and the garage is too small for adequately maneuvering a car in or out of narrow doors, especially regarding the left-space door.
8. We believe in the active retention of car values by keeping them unscratched (regarding the middle post) and hangered daily/nightly to protect them from the harsh Oklahoma elements (a salient issue during the recent cold spell); this is difficult to maintain via delicate in-and-out maneuvering with two doors on a daily basis.
9. In the sense of American practicality, older single door garages were exchanged by the late 1940s with the more practical automatic double garage and its one wide door for the good reasons of safety and efficiency (see quote below).
10. In the sense of historic preservation, we will retain in the double gate the styles of the older single door tradition as much as we can, but we would kindly like to be respected in our wishes to aid our increasing health and safety needs to have a thoroughly practical solution in the form of a double gate.
“Early American garages were basically sheds with a barn door that could be swung open and closed. The structures worked to store vehicles, though they did very little to keep the cars warm, and were difficult to maintain. Opening and closing such a big door each day led to wear and tear, and if snow was on the ground, swinging the door open was nearly impossible. Sliding doors were invented in the early 1920’s, and while those definitely were an upgrade, having a sliding door in place meant the garage needed to be twice the size of the door so it could slide open and closed. In 1921 the overhead garage door was invented by C.G. Johnson. Five years after that, in 1926, Johnson invented the first electric garage door opener meant to help those who had trouble lifting their heavy doors. The invention took off, and soon every car owner in America wanted a garage with an overhead electric garage door opener.” [https://www.blueskybuilders.com/blog/history-american-garages/](https://www.blueskybuilders.com/blog/history-american-garages/)

Composite Roof Shingles: matching type and color with those on main house exactly.

Gutter System (consisting of light aluminum): Above gutter materials were newly installed at 727/725 NE 14th Street’s main house (Nov. 2018); same type and color of gutter and downspouts will be used for the new garage.
Horizontal Board Siding (horizontal orientation matching other neighborhood backyard buildings; final color will be egg-shell white in sync with neighbors' rear buildings – see photo below); the finish will be smooth and not “wood-like” – the installed width of the siding boards will be ca. 8 inches leaving them with approximately 6 inches of exposure.

Above: Rear buildings of immediate neighbors: on the left the one to the west, and in the center the one in the north; the siding boards of our proposed new garage will be almost exactly as what the neighbors have on theirs.

G. Additional Documentation for New Construction or Additions
Floor height with comparison to neighboring properties and primary structure (additions): Even though the new concrete foundation will be c. 5 inches higher than the previous one, this slab will still remain about one (1) foot lower than the main floor of our duplex. The current slab is about 3 inches lower than the foundational level of the big apartment complex immediately adjacent to the east (“University Medical Center Apartments,” 733 NE 14th Street). According to observable facts during rain storms, these 3 inches contribute a lot to the stormwater barrages that have been entering our garage predictably in the past.
Total building height with comparison to neighboring properties and primary structure (additions): The total (new) height of the new garage will be 13 feet and 5 inches (this is an estimate because the tip of the roof cannot be discerned accurately as of now). The garage will therefore be the lowest of, or matching all other backyard buildings in its immediate neighborhood.

Site plan with setbacks and siting of neighboring properties: please review C. Site Plans to view exact garage location. As indicated, the nearest building is the large 2-story apartment complex to the east (733 NE 14th Street). It is only 6.5 feet set apart from our current garage. The two properties are separated by a curb line (see main Site Drawing “Front View” and photo 1)). Topographical information for existing and any proposed changes: no topographical variance/implications can be anticipated from this project.

-- THE END --

Thank you for considering this application seriously. We love our historic neighborhood and are looking forward to adding to its value through the new and good-looking garage in our backyard.

Sincerely,

M&K Reinschmidt
520-237-2943
bak7si@live.com
Building Inspection

Oklahoma City, March 25, 2021

To Whom It May Concern:

In close consultation with three local contractors, I, Michael Reinschmidt, have inspected the garage building at 725 NE 14th Street in Oklahoma City’s Historic Lincoln Terrace East area. This building, in the backyard of Kerstin and Michael Reinschmidt’s residence, is leaning to the west indicating impending structural impair. In general, this structure is beyond any value of repair and needs to be torn down to avoid increasing safety and hazard consequences.

The 15 feet wide opening for cars to enter used to feature an automatic double door that at one point was replaced with two-winged swing doors that are no longer holding up to their hinges. The entrance door to what once was a small storage room to the west of the car area, is falling apart rapidly. The roof to that room has been absent since we purchased the property in 2017.

The roof rafters are visibly starting to sag due to ageing, dry-rot, and several heavy layers of old composite and wooden shingles. The sagging roof is increasingly putting pressure on the main frame to be pushed out. At this point I would hesitate to invest in straightening and stabilizing the failing frame. To alleviate roof pressure, the old electric motor, chain train, and its steel rails for an automatic gate opener was recently removed from the rafters (see photo 6, right image). One main support beam (photo 6, left) in the rear (or north) part of the roof area is already cracked severely and currently prevented from breakage only by one healthy post provisionally installed (see image).

The concrete slab is overwhelmingly broken into dozens of large and hundreds of small pieces. Disjointed pieces have been elevated or dropped from the original level by subterranean root activity during the past 90+ years. They are causing a safety hazard for persons not anticipating significant level confusion when walking. Several holes in the lower siding have caused feral cats of the neighborhood in the past to enter the structure and cause unsanitary conditions on work benches, shelves, and vehicles (see photo series under 7).

A significant drop of the original concrete slab level toward the front of the former double gate is causing stormwater to flood at least the first third of the parking area during thunderstorms. The water then sinks into the holes and cracks of the broken slab enabling mold and bad odors. All of these floor problems could be solved by a new, elevated slab, infused with a rebar addition.

The former double garage gate was taken out at an unknown time to be replaced by a heavy two-winged contraption. This arrangement is now largely inoperable as the left side must be held in place by a set of heavy bar clamps. The right wing is still useable, though by application of substantial physical strength only. The frames of both wings have been rotting and the gate is no longer lockable.
The entire roof of the added lean-to has been destroyed over the years by the force of the elements. Finally, an obviously retarded interior electric system plus outdoor lighting is in urgent need of overhaul as it regularly trips the automatic safety fuse during thunderstorms.

The severe disrepair of this structure is apparent; it is diminishing the value not only of the property itself but also of the overall neatness of the street and this historic district. Given these reasons, I strongly recommend a new building which is what I am applying for with your Commission. Thank you very much for your considerations.

Sincerely,

Michael Reinschmidt
Former Construction Laborer in Half-Timbered House Restorations,
Siegerland County, Germany

Email: bak7si@live.com
iPhone: 520-237-2943
Expert Statement:

Given my personal expertise from 15 years of hands-on work in historic house restoration I declare the garage structure in our backyard at 725/727 NE 14th Street, OKC 73104, to be in a state of disrepair beyond any reasonable consideration or affordable solution toward original restoration. Although not a formally trained architect or engineer, I have sufficient skill and familiarity with and restoration knowledge of historic house restoration to recommend that this structure be floored and rebuilt completely.

Resulting from my stated work experience in rural Germany from 1980 to 1995 (see images enclosed), I am a strong proponent of historic preservation and applaud the work of your Commission(s). However, I also learned to discern distinctly from experience and the historic preservation literature when the courage for demolition and rebuilding is better than the decision to preserve an old building at all costs.

Types and samples of restoration projects I've participated in as full-time laborer, hands-on volunteer, or otherwise contributed to in Siegerland County, Germany.

The overwhelming photographic evidence of decay in the case at hand (727/725 NE 14th Street, Historic Lincoln Terrace-East) should help convince you to support our application for building
a new garage that we would like to integrate as much as possible into the older contexts of existing architectural surroundings. As a fact, the integrated looks of the new garage will optically excel, for example, vis-à-vis the massive two-story University Medical Center Apartment complex to the immediate east of our property (733 NE 14th Street, please see photos in the application document).

Our careful plans for rebuilding also emanate from a deep commitment to a non-gentrified neighborhood and its continued affordable living spaces. Our plan will thus fully honor the interests of the area’s overall historic integrity. There are many folks in our neighborhood who pursue various dreams about rebuilding or restoring existing buildings. Since our district has been turned “historic,” however, folks have become frustrated with the amount of paperwork to be provided to authorities heeding countless rules and regulations and with the administrative hurdles and permit costs involved.

This frustration is serving neither the goals of historic preservation nor preventing the increasing gentrification of this particular area. By means of your approval we will be able to share our application documents with our eager neighbors who also have preservation plans but who depend on know-how, time management, and lots of encouragement to tackle the overwhelming barriers that currently seem to be in place. Please support us in these efforts as a community.

Thank you for your continued service to the Historic Lincoln Terrace preservation effort and to serving this community with its specific needs and sociocultural circumstances.

Sincerely,
Michael Reinschmidt
Dear Ms. Jones,

Below you find the specifics for the double garage door. It’s an amazing package and it would perfectly fit in with the existing historic door- and window styles of our 1928 house. Please share with the Commission members.

I’m also in the process of obtaining an estimate for the side door, but currently can’t be sure whether to get it on time for Thursday’s meeting. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Michael Reinschmidt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Door/Panel:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Size: 16’ 0&quot; x 8’ 0”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- WindCode: W0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Type: Gallery® - Premium Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design: Long Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction: 3-layer 1 3/8” Polystyrene Insulation R-Value 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Model: GDLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Color: Ultra-Grain® Oak Slate Finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Top Section: Long with Square Grilles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Glass: Double Pane Clear Glass (Insulated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Spring: Coated Torsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Track Size: 2”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project Type: | 16x8 Grey Slate Vintage Door |

| Subtotal  | $5,592.99 |
| Tax       | $441.57   |
| Total     | $6,034.56 |
• Track Type: standard
• Lift Type:
• Mount Type: Bracket
• Track Radius: 15
• Roof Pitch: none
• High Lift:
• Handles: Spade Lift Handle
• Step Plates: Spade Step Plate

Install Trim for New Door Weather Seal Kit: Vinyl Weather Seal Kit 1.00 $175.46 $175.46

8550LM with 8' Belt Elite Series Ultra Quiet Lift Motor: LiftMaster 3/4HP DC Ultra Quiet Lift Motor Wi-Fi Connectivity and Mobile App Access Model: 8550LM Rail: 8' Belt Rail Remote: 1 1.00 $724.53 $724.53

Standard Labor Rate Standard Labor Rate

---

Begin forwarded message:

From: A1 Garage <noreply+495594@servicetitan.com>
Subject: Estimate from A1 Garage Door Service
Date: May 4, 2021 at 1:00:12 PM CDT
To: bak7si@live.com
Resent-From: <bak7si@live.com>
Reply-To: A1 Garage <nchiarolla@a1garage.com>

Hi Michael,

It was a pleasure speaking with you. I attached your estimate for your new garage door. If you have any questions feel free to reach out at any time. 414.253.3176

Thanks,
Nicole
414.253.3176

Thank you so much for the opportunity to quote your garage door project. We are pleased to present the following quote/s for your review. To view your quotes online please click the link below.

Click here to view your estimate(s)

If you have any questions concerning the products or pricing please don't hesitate to ask.

Have a great day!

A1 Garage Door Service
www.a1garage.com
Good Morning Ms. Jones,

Based on your regulation requirements pasted below I have now selected doors that I hope will comply with your specifications. I sent you one email with product specifics for the double garage door yesterday.

Product Info from Home Depot for the “pedestrian door” as entrance to the side of the garage is attached below. Please keep in mind that door colors can be changed easily if the Commission sees fit. I’m glad I finally found some products that match your descriptions.

I hope my searches can be shared timely with your board members. Thank you.

Sincerely,
M. Reinschmidt

F. Products
1. Cut sheet or brochure of any commercial product to be used, with dimensions, materials and color
2. Photographs or drawings of custom products to be used, with dimensions, materials and color

Garage overhead doors must be made of wood, composite wood, metal frame with wood veneer, or fiberglass. The finished texture must be smooth. Doors with rectangular panels or flush panels are usually approved by the board.

Garage pedestrian doors are recommended to made of wood, aluminum-clad wood, or composite wood. A plain or paneled door with a smooth finish would likely be approved by the board. Steel doors are not recommended and not likely to be approved by the board.
Larry Stein—Oklahoma County Assessor Public Access System

Real Property Display - Screen Produced   3/22/2021 4:08:38 PM

Account: R034511250    Type: Residential
Location: 727 NE 14TH ST

Building Name/Occupant: REINSCHMIDT KERSTIN M & MICHAEL C
Owner Name 1:
Owner Name 2:
Billing Address 1: 727 NE 14TH ST
Billing Address 2:
City, State, Zip OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73104-4622
Country: (If noted)
Lot Dimensions: Width 50  Depth 147
Land Size: 0.17  Acres

Owner Name 2: Parent Acct:
Billing Address 2: School System: Oklahoma City #89
Country:

Full Legal Description: HOWES CAPITOL 005 018

Comp Sales Address/Date/Price (ordered by relevancy)
909 EAST DR OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 09/27/2019  $220,000
939 EAST DR OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 10/24/2019  $125,000
913 EAST DR OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 09/25/2019  $116,500
945 NE 16TH ST OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73104-4609 10/31/2019  $172,000
719 NE 17TH ST OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 06/18/2020  $267,000
735 NE 14TH ST OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73104-4622 03/20/2020  $275,000

--

--

Property Account Status/Adjustments/Exemptions

Account # Grant Year Exemption Description Amount
R034511250 2019 3% Cap Homestead 0
R034511250 2018 Homestead 1,000

Property Deed Transaction History (Recorded in the County Clerk's Office)

Date Type Book Page Price Grantor Grantee
6/26/2017 Deeds 13476 1484 169,000 MTM HOLDINGS LLC REINSCHMIDT KERSTIN M & MICHAEL C
11/15/2006 Other 10322 36 0 OSWALD TRACE MTM HOLDINGS LLC
8/10/2006 Deeds 10213 1474 82,500 MAGUR GARY & COLLEEN OSWALD TRACE
11/2/2004 Deeds 9518 1394 90,000 HAYES ROSE MARIE HAYES ROSE MARIE
10/25/2004 Deeds 9518 1392 0 HAYES RAYMOND JR & CLARA L HAYES RAYMOND JR & CLARA L

--

[1/2]
### Last Mailed Notice of Value (N.O.V.) Information/History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Taxable Market Value</th>
<th>Gross Assessed</th>
<th>Exemption</th>
<th>Net Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>03/19/2021</td>
<td>151,500</td>
<td>140,595</td>
<td>15,465</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>14,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>04/16/2018</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>16,830</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>15,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>03/17/2017</td>
<td>191,000</td>
<td>99,021</td>
<td>10,891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>03/28/2016</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>94,307</td>
<td>10,373</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>03/16/2015</td>
<td>144,571</td>
<td>89,817</td>
<td>9,879</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Property Building Permit History

No Building Permit records returned.

Click button on building number to access detailed information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg #</th>
<th>Vacant/Improved Land</th>
<th>Bldg Description</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>SqFt</th>
<th># Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>Duplex One half Story</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>