

OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

APRIL 19, 2010

A special meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the chairman, George Gaffney, on Monday, April 19, 2010, at 5:00 p.m., to discuss the five building permit applications submitted by Cynthia Egan, property owner of 215 A (a.k.a. parcel 1) and 215 B (a.k.a. parcel 2) South Street.

Also in attendance were commission members Dorothy Fenwick, Suzanne Litty, Heinrich Schmitz, Jennifer Stanley, and William Dial.

The commission members first addressed the proposed fencing for both parcel 1 and parcel 2. The contractor, Delbert Adams, and architect, Vince Green for these projects were both present to explain the applications to the committee. Mr. Green explained to the commission that they had eliminated the use of wire fencing for both yards having decided it should come out in favor of picket fencing. Plans were to have two picket fences adjacent to one another because the neighboring property has a short picket fence that is already existing there. Mr. Schmitz pointed out the different design elements between the fence planned for parcel 1 and the fence planned for parcel 2. Mrs. Fenwick made a motion to recommend that the commission accept parcel 2 as presented. Mr. Gaffney interjected stating that he wanted no motion until the people in the audience could comment. A member from the audience stated that they did not feel that what was being said about the fencing for either property was clear. Mr. Schmitz expressed concern regarding the two different styles of fencing that were going to be placed up against each other on parcel 1 with the neighboring property having one distinct style of fencing and Ms. Egan proposing another type of fencing and asked how this could be reconciled. One of Ms. Egan's representatives responded that originally they had wanted wire fencing for that particular area because the wire fencing would disappear in the landscaping. He added that with the wood fence, with the approval of the commission, they are planning on going to the neighbor and asking if it makes sense to have two fences next to each other. Mr. Schmitz again stressed that the fencing on the one side of parcel 1 bothered him, particularly since the neighboring property had a 3' fence and Ms. Egan needed a 4' fence. Because the fences were of different designs and running up right against one another, Mr. Schmitz pointed out the fencing would be hard to maintain and would not look right. Mrs. Fenwick made a motion to accept the plans as presented for parcel 1. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley.

Ian Scott, property owner of 213 South Street, and direct next door neighbor to Ms. Egan's parcel 1 property, spoke stating that in several ways the fencing concept was designed to isolate. He added that he thought it would have been more desirable had he and the owner spoke about the fencing prior to this meeting. He added that he was shocked to think that the HDC would ask him to change his existing fencing and that two different fence styles next to each other was not a good thing and a fence inside a fence was absurd. He questioned how it would be maintained, how would it be painted, could they discuss a transition of fencing? Mr. Scott added that he would be willing to negotiate but at this time he felt he was coming under pressure. Mr. Schmitz agreed that Mr. Scott had some valid points and that they should resolve

these questions before carrying forward. Mrs. Fenwick decided to withdraw her motion with Mrs. Stanley agreeing that before any decisions are made, the fencing issue needed to be worked out between the two neighbors. Some of the commission members made suggestions that should be considered such as making sure that the fencing around the swimming pool is to code, considering the visibility of the fence to the street, possibly setting the 4' fence back off from the street or shortening up the distance of the 4' fencing. Mr. Gaffney stated that he did not think the commission was ready to make a decision on the fencing for either parcel at this time since there was a lot to consider. Mr. Green asked what they could do between now and then to resolve this issue. Mr. Gaffney suggested getting in touch with the neighbor and that it was up to the architect to take the suggestions given at this night's meeting and come back to the HDC with their changes.

The commission next reviewed the building permit application for the proposed new house and accessory structure to be placed on parcel 2. South Street resident Christine Tochko stated that the proposed accessory building was to be built out of brick and that she felt it did not meet the streetscape as it appears on the rest of South Street. It was recommended to the builder and architect that the accessory building have the same kind of siding as the proposed house which the builder accepted. A discussion took place regarding the house, particularly the design of the front glass door to be covered by shutters. Some of the audience members objected to the look along with some of the commission members. It was agreed by the members present to table the application until their next regularly scheduled meeting in May.

The commission then turned to the review of the proposed pool and spa for lot 2. Because there were questions about the fencing as it was tied into the safety and necessity of the swimming pool it was also agreed by the members to table this application as well until the next regularly scheduled meeting.

The commission then reviewed the application to install a prefabricated fiberglass spa and stone patio on parcel #1. Since last meeting with the commission, the plans for the spa had been revised. The spa would be recessed into the existing grade with the surrounding grade to be retained with a timber wall including a grouping of hedges from the water side to protect the view of the spa. The commission members agreed that the changes to this application were acceptable to those that had previously been submitted. A motion was made to accept the application as revised. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby
Assistant Clerk