

OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

APRIL 5, 2010

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the chairman, George Gaffney, on Monday, April 5, 2010, at 5:00 p.m., in the meeting room of the Oxford Community Services Building.

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

The minutes of the meeting of March 1, 2010 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The historic commission held a special meeting on Monday, March 22, 2010 at 5 p.m., in the meeting room of the Oxford Community Services Building in order to consult with Mr. and Mrs. Giovanni Salvo, and their architect, Tim Kearns, with regards to their proposed addition to their house at 512 E. Strand prior to their submitting a building permit application. Members present were George Gaffney, Dorothy Fenwick, and Suzanne Litty. The members agreed that if Mr. Kearns were to change the building plans to show the extension of the roof materials around the bays in order to create a small roof then the project would be acceptable.

The following building permits were reviewed at this night's meeting:

1. Permit #08-33, James Turrell, 308 Tilghman Street, revision to existing permit to revise previously approved garage doors. Though no one was present to represent the application, the application was self explanatory. A motion was made by Mrs. Stanley to approve the application with the changes as noted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmitz and unanimously carried without further discussion.

2. Permit #10-11, Mr. and Mrs. Brian Wells, 102 Tilghman Street, construct new accessory building. At the time in which the commission began their review of this application, no one was present to discuss the building permit. Mr. Gaffney stated that from the papers the commission had been given he could not tell where the new accessory building was going to be placed. Mr. Gaffney also noted that he was aware there was a right-of-way involved with this property and until the commission knows whether or not the proposed accessory building falls within or outside the right-of-way he did not feel the commission could take any action on the permit. Mrs. Fenwick stated she had looked at the property and saw where the shed was staked out to be placed. She asked Mr. Gaffney if he was referring to a right-of-way involving Factory Street and Banks Street. Mr. Gaffney responded that he had seen a sketch somewhere and remembered that there was a right-of-way somewhere in that area. Mr. Schmitz added that the plans needed to have a plat showing exactly, to scale, where the shed was planning on being placed. He also expressed concern as to why the proposed roof on the shed was not symmetrical. It was agreed to table the application until next month when someone could be present to discuss the application with the commission. At this point, a representative from Mazzatenta Construction appeared to discuss the application. Mr. Gaffney explained to the

gentleman that arrived late that he or Mr. Mazzatenta (the contractor) would have to come back before the commission with a plat, that he needed to address the right-of-way, have more specific views, and a plan to make the roof more symmetrical and that the commission needed to see exactly on the plat where the shed was going to be placed.

3. Permit #10-12, Susan Hovanec, 308 N. Morris Street, request for in-ground concrete pool in backyard of property surrounded by a black 48" fence. Both Ms. Hovanec, and her pool contractor, Stephen Gurley, were present to discuss the application. Mr. Gurley explained to the commission that the owner was proposing to build an in-ground swimming pool in the rear of her yard which would not be visible from the street. The pool would be set back 35' from the rear property line. A 4' black tubular fence would surround the swimming pool. Twelve inch flagstone coping would be placed around the pool but other than that, there would be no decking around the pool. The commission asked that Mr. Gurley provide a copy of what the flagstone coping would look like around the pool and that a permit would not be issued until they had a copy of that for the file. Ms. Fenwick made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and carried without further discussion. Prior to discussion of the next application Mr. Schmitz asked Ms. Hovanec about the shutters on her house which she had removed. Ms. Hovanec responded that the shutters needed to be stripped and repainted and that due to the expense of having such work done, she was not planning on addressing the shutters at this time.

Prior to the review of the next building permit application, Mrs. Fenwick announced that she had discovered in the application of Mr. and Mrs. Wells a plat of the Wells' property that had been made in 2008. She noted that the plat showed other houses on Tilghman Street and that Mr. Mazzatenta had drawn on the plat the location of the proposed shed. However, there was no mention of a right-of-way on the plat. Mrs. Fenwick asked that the minutes be amended to indicate that there was a plat showing the location of the proposed shed, but that the plat was not clear as to a right-of-way.

4. Permit #10-13, Paul Haddaway, 107 High Street, demolition of house and out buildings. Mr. Haddaway explained to the commission that the house had been involved in a fire back in December 2009 in which ¾ of the house was fully involved in flames. The internal section of the house now consisted as a burnt out shell with structural damage throughout the house. For that reason, Mr. Haddaway stated he wanted to demolish the house along with the outbuildings which are already in the process of falling down. Neighbor Brud Patterson spoke stating that he had no objection to the house being taken down but that he would like to see the rubble cleaned up as soon as possible. Next door neighbor Jane Lawrence added that in glancing over at the house she has seen people go behind the house and wander in and around it and that anyone could get hurt in it. Mr. Gaffney added that he would like to see the work done within the next 30 to 60 days. Mrs. Stanley made a motion that permission be given for demolition. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmitz and unanimously carried without further discussion.

5. Permit #10-14, Mr. and Mrs. John Toups, 200 West Street, lift pre-laid front walkway; remove stone driveway to replace with brick strips; remove stepping stones at side of house and

replace with brick; extend width of existing planter and replace sides with brick. The Toups were represented by their landscape architects, Rob and Jill Hartkopf from Oxford Lawn and Landscape. Mr. Hartkopf explained to the commission that the homeowners would like to remove their front walkway, which is too wide and overpowering, and replace it with a more narrow, brick front walkway. Mr. and Mrs. Toups would also like to remove their gravel driveway and replace it with brick strips. At the end of the driveway there is a shed which has a walkway between it and the house. This area currently houses slate pieces and ivy. The homeowners would like to remove the slate and ivy and replace it with brick. These changes will result in a reduction of coverage from that which is currently located on this property. Mrs. Fenwick made a motion to accept the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmitz and unanimously carried without further discussion.

6. Permit #10-14, Robert Schultz, 208 Market Street, rebuild existing 12' x 12' shed; change flat/shed roof to gabled roof; add windows and doors. Mr. Schultz explained to the commission that he would like to rebuild his existing 12' x 12' shed and change the roof from a shed roof to a peaked roof. The new rebuilt shed would incorporate a door and new windows. The same siding as located on the house would be used on the shed. The same footprint would be used. Mr. Schmitz asked about the pitch of the proposed roof being 12 and 6. He pointed out to Mr. Schultz that the guidelines suggest a 7/12. A question was also raised about the use of the windows in the shed. Mr. Schultz explained that he wanted the windows for light and that no one would be able to see the windows from the street. Ms. Litty made a motion to accept the application pending the change of the of the roof pitch to 7/12. Mr. Schultz was agreeable to the change. The motion was seconded with all in favor.

7. Permits #10-16 and #10-18, Cynthia Egan, 215 South Street (parcels 1 and 2), fencing around properties. Ms. Egan was represented by her contractor Delbert Adams and architect, Vince Green. Mr. Adams explained to the commission that Ms. Egan had bought 215 South Street, consisting of two separate parcels. Her concept is that she would like to divide the fencing for the existing house and for the vacant lot and would like to have a new home and pool on the vacant lot and a spa put on the lot of the existing house. He added that the owner would like to have the ability to maintain the individual lots but also provide the benefit of having one large continuous lot. The use of fencing on both lots would be twofold – it would be in keeping with the restrictions of having a pool and well as serving as control of the lots. In looking at this permit, several styles of fencing were proposed consisting of picket, wire fencing, and split rail fencing. Mrs. Fenwick pointed out that the guidelines prohibit rail fencing and that wire fences were not acceptable either. Mr. Adams noted that the owner would be amenable to whatever the group suggested with regards to fencing as long as it was 4' in height. Mrs. Stanley voiced that she was concerned with the fencing creating a compound look on the two properties. Mr. Schmitz suggested two different fence designs for each property. The group did not want to see fencing directly in front of the property and with regards to fencing material, the commission would be receptive to only wood or metal/cast iron fencing. Mr. Gaffney summarized the thoughts of the commission with regards to the fencing on "Lot 1" which were to delete the wire fencing from the road to the cross piece and from the area where it goes to the house and that a picket fence could be installed up to 3' in front of the house, if wanted, for

decorative purposes. Mrs. Fenwick made a motion to approve Phase I (which refers to the existing house at 215 South Street) with the fences as described, precluding and eliminating split rail fencing and wire fences while permitting case iron and/or picket, all of which would be at a 4' level. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried. In discussing the fence permit application for "Lot 2" (the vacant lot), Mr. Gaffney tried to sum up some of the concerns of the other members by pointing out that on this lot there is an area that has a solid piece that fits up against the neighbor and questions had been raised as to whether or not that piece was necessary. In that regards, the commission would like to have 4' picket fencing all the way around that will match the picket on phase 1 unless there is some kind of objection there. The commission would like to see just one kind of fencing used on "Lot 2" which may be either wood or iron. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to accept Phase 2 of the Egan property fencing using pickets and taking out the solid piece to hide the present location of the pool equipment with the note that the owner can use either cast iron or wood. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmitz and unanimously carried.

8. Permit #10-19, Cynthia Egan, 215 South St. (parcel 1), install pre-fabricated spa and stone patio. Mr. Adams described to the commission the flagstone patio with blue stone paving Ms. Egan would like to install. The spa (a.k.a. "hot tub") would be above ground, it would be made of fiberglass with a wood skirt around it having two steps leading up to it. It would probably be visible from the water though Mr. Adams noted that some landscaping could be used to obscure it though the owner would probably like to still keep a view of the water. All the equipment of the spa is built into the sides of the spa. The spa would be screened. Ms. Litty asked if the owner could consider lowering the spa as she was opposed to the height of the spa from ground level. Mr. Schmitz agreed it would help the look of the spa if it were to be lowered. Mrs. Fenwick suggested that the owner might want to re-evaluate the location of the spa and Mr. Gaffney suggested making it as invisible as possible. It was suggested and agreed upon by both members of the Historic District Commission and the contractor and architect to table this application. Mr. Gaffney offered to hold a special meeting for Ms. Egan with regards to her applications since many changes and corrections were being made to the permits.

9. Permit #10-17, Cynthia Egan, 215 South St. (parcel 2), new pool and spa. Mr. Adams described the application by stating that there would be coping around the pool with grass coming up to its edge with a band of blue stone in concrete. The pool would be located behind the new, proposed house. Mrs. Stanley noted that the location of pool equipment would be right up against the neighbors property and thought the owner should incorporate the pool equipment over towards her other property as she thought it was not fair that the neighbor have to take the brunt of the noise. It was also suggested that the pool equipment be enclosed into a small shed that the owner was planning on building. A question was raised by the representatives for Ms. Egan as to whether or not there was any way they could keep the accessory building 2' off the building restriction line if it was used to enclose the pool equipment. The commission suggested that that question be posed to the Planning Commission. It was also agreed to table this application until later to see if the accessory

building could be used to accommodate the pool equipment and whether or not its location could be shifted.

10. Permit #10-15, Cynthia Egan, 215 South St. (parcel 2), new single family residence. Mr. Schmitz commented that he thought the plans for the house shown showed a well thought out design that would fit into the streetscape. However, he questioned one detail which was the use of round windows and fan lights and asked if there was a way to simplify that decorative approach. Mr. Green, the architect, responded it was possible and explained that the house was conceived as a combination of two styles found most often in this area – Victorian and Greek revival. He added that he thought the fan lights would be appropriate to pay homage to the more Victorian moments in this area and would bring light from both directions while creating a window that would give interest to the room. Mr. Green stated that if the commission wanted something quieter, that could be done. Mr. Schmitz thought that the window as shown stuck out in the streetscape. Mr. Green pointed out that he had gotten the idea from viewing St. Paul's Church, located on the corner of Morris and South Streets. Mrs. Fenwick asked about a round window in the back of the house. Mr. Green stated that if that was an issue, he could change it. There was also a question about sliding shutters shown in the front of the house. Again, the architect noted that those could be changed as well. It was agreed by all present to table this application as well and that either a special meeting could be held for Ms. Egan or everyone could wait until the May meeting to go over everything again.

This concluded the review of building permit applications.

A consultation was held with Pamela Hamilton, property owner at 100 Sullivan's Alley to discuss alternative energy. Ms. Hamilton informed the commission she was looking into the possibility of installing a wind turbine on her property. She presented the commission with several pictures of wind turbines she had found on the internet. One of the ones she was interested in was 30' high. She asked the commission if there was any possibility of going ahead with her plans in order for her to work with a wind turbine company. Mrs. Fenwick asked where she would put a turbine. Ms. Hamilton responded that it would be somewhere along her property line where there are some trees located. After some discussion, Mrs. Stanley noted that the commission needed some education on this topic and suggested to Ms. Hamilton that if she were to find a supplier who had set one of these up, go out, see it, and take some pictures, the commission might be positively influenced provided they were given some kind of visual and opinion on this. Ms. Hamilton stated since there seemed to be some openness from the commission on this she would get back with the wind turbine company she was working with and let them know what was said at this meeting.

Mrs. Fenwick said she was approached by an individual who asked if the shed/garage at 104 N. Morris Street was considered historic or not. Mr. Gaffney noted that the building was a mess. Ms. Litty added that she did not think it was historic and that it was basically falling down. Mr. Gaffney asked that if anyone is interested in it they should come before the commission.

Page 6
Oxford Historic District Commission Minutes
April 5, 2010

As a final note, a question was raised about what should be done about the memo sent to the Commissioners regarding alternative energy. Mr. Gaffney stated he would get a letter off to the Commissioners but would let the group look at it before sending it out.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby
Assistant Clerk