

## OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

### MINUTES

**MAY 3, 2010**

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the chairman, George Gaffney, on Monday, May 3, 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, and Jennifer Stanley.

The minutes of the meeting of April 5, 2010 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following building permits were reviewed by the commission:

1. Permit #10-20, Peter Rouse, 208 South St., replace broken kitchen window. No one was present to discuss the application with the commission. The request was to replace the existing broken kitchen window with a wood window. A motion was made by Mr. Schmitz to accept the application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried.
2. Permit #10-22, Brian and Julie Wells, 102 Tilghman St., 3' white Oxford fence in front yard and portion of east side yard. No one was present to discuss the application. The style of fence requested was for an Oxford style fence. The application was self-explanatory. A motion was made by Mrs. Stanley to approve the plans as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmitz and unanimously carried without further discussion.
3. Permit #10-21, Nadine Russell, 205 Tilghman St., repair/replace porch floor and railing damaged by sun exposure and water. Ms. Russell presented the commission with a flyer which described the "Trex" decking material she was planning on using. The flooring would be gray and the railing would be white. Mr. Schmitz asked about the existing posts in the railing and how the new railings would look in comparison. Ms. Russell responded that the new railing would look almost like the existing railings that she now has and that what she was requesting would not be decorative. Ms. Litty made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Fenwick and unanimously carried without further discussion.
4. Permit #10-23, Jane McCarthy, 310 N. Morris St., replace existing fence on property line and continue fence to street fence. No one was present to discuss the application. Because there were some questions raised as to the exact location of the fencing and where it ends and if it connects to other things, it was agreed to table the application until the applicant or a representative could be present to explain the application.
5. Permit #10-24, Kathryn Cram, 209 S. Morris St., replace two small sections of roof in rear of house. Mrs. Cram was represented by her contractor, Pat Mayock. Mr. Mayock presented the commission with photos of the condition of the roof in back of Mrs. Cram's house. The roofing in the front of the house had been done in black metal. The back of the

house has shingles which need to be replaced. The owner is requesting to remove those existing shingles and replace them with regular asphalt shingles in a black color so that they would match up with the front of the house. The back of the house also houses a flat porch roof, which is not highly visible from the street, which has a built up membrane with some gravel on it that the owner also wants to replace with another membrane roof. Mr. Schmitz asked about the detail of the flat roof. Mr. Mayock explained that he would install a 3" piece of new metal over the face that would attach to the roof. He would then bring the rubber over that and seal it to the top flange. Mr. Schmitz asked if the metal structure would be visible or not. Mr. Mayock responded that it would not be and that one would just see the same white piece of metal that is already visible. He further noted that one would not see any rubber coming over and that one would not see anything fastened to the side. Mrs. Stanley suggested that in the future the commission should ask to see a picture of the edge (of any flat roof). Mr. Mayock stated that the membrane roof would look the same as it currently does and that the new roof would have the same flashing, the same width, and same color. 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 #10-25, Richard and Nancy Newton, 210 N. Morris St., proposal to build a porch onto rear of building. Mr. Newton explained to the commission that he wanted to built a deck out from the back door of his house and to remove some of the existing sidewalk in the yard in order to have more footage to work with. The deck would be built with pressure treated lumber about 6" wide. It would have railing which would have some lighted solar caps on it. Mrs. Fenwick asked if the railings were going to be painted. Mr. Newton responded that railings could be painted, to which Ms. Litty responded that the commission requests that they do be painted. Mr. Newton added that the deck itself was going to be left natural with a stain on it. Mrs. Stanley pointed out that the permit was confusing because Mr. Newton referred to the deck as a porch. Mr. Newton clarified that what he wanted to build was a deck and corrected his permit application to read as such. Questions were raised about the use of solar lighting on the deck posts and that the piers were going to be wood and concrete. Mr. Schmitz asked about the historic style of the building. Mr. Newton explained that the back of the house had no historic elements and that an addition had been added to the house in the past 20 years which had been built on cinder block. Mr. Schmitz asked why the applicant needed the solar lighting. Mr. Newton explained that it was a matter of safety and that though he had a back door light, he was worried that the light would not reach the steps leading up to the deck. Mrs. Fenwick reminded the group that they had talked about starting to think about solar items and this might be a good example to test. Mrs. Fenwick made a motion to accept the application as presented even though it would include two departures from the guidelines – the use of solar caps and concrete piers rather than brick piers and that she was very conscious of those two things. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and carried with the following votes:

Dorothy Fenwick	-	aye
Jennifer Stanley	-	aye
Suzanne Litty	-	aye
Heinrich Schmitz	-	nay

7. Permit #10-26, Cynthia Egan, 215 South Street (parcel 1), approval of paint color for existing house. Ms. Egan, along with her contractor and architect, were present to explain the application. It was explained that the decking on the porches would not change in color, along with the stairs, lattice work and columns – all of which would remain white. The siding color proposed was a gray shade with the shutters to be painted a dark blue and the front door a yellow color. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to accept the colors for the house on parcel #1 as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmitz with all in favor.

8. Permit #10-15, Cynthia Egan, 215 South Street (parcel 2), new house and accessory building. Modifications to the proposed accessory building were explained to the commission whereby the owner raised the pitch of the roof from what was previously submitted, along with changing the window style entirely from having small transom windows running along the top to punched windows having shutters. The building would be covered by board and batten material but the color would match that of the other structures on the lot. The original brick work that had been proposed was changed and replaced with lattice work on the garden courtyard side. The east and west elevations would be identical with a profile to the street looking much more traditional and historic. With regards to the house, it was noted that the owner had elected not to go with solid doors on the front of the residence as she felt that would change the flavor of what she was looking to do. Ms. Litty made a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley. A question was raised by a member of the audience who noted that in a previous historic meeting she thought there was some concern raised as to the style of the front door not fitting in with the street and that that was going to change. Mr. Schmitz responded that in looking at the streetscape he did not see the need to adhere to any one door as the street has many different kinds of doors.

9. Permit #10-17, Cynthia Egan, 215 South Street (parcel 2), swimming pool and spa. There was a brief discussion by the commission where upon it was agreed that the swimming pool was not very visible from the street and that it sat low enough to the ground so that it was not easily seen from the water. A motion was made by Mr. Schmitz to accept the application as presented. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried without further discussion.

10. Permit #10-16, Cynthia Egan, 215 South Street (parcel 2), fencing and gates. There was a brief discussion by the commission whereby a motion was made to approve the fencing for parcel 2 with the following notes: a 4' wood picket fence will go around the south side of the house, which has been amended, whereby the length of the fence has been reduced and marked on the plans, the 4' fence shown in the front of the new proposed house was approved, and the gate and fence by the pool house were approved, thus all the fencing on parcel 2 was approved. There being no further questions or discussion, the fencing was approved.

11. Permit #10-18, Cynthia Egan, 215 South Street (parcel 1), install fencing and gate. It was explained to the commission that the fence will be identical to the neighbor's existing fencing and will transition from a 3' fence up to a 4' fence. It was noted, for the record, that the commission wanted to make sure that the wood fence between the Scott's property and Ms.

Egan's property matches the existing fence that borders Mr. Scott's property. Mr. Scott, the neighbor, felt there were some details that needed to be solved such as where the "good side" of the fence would be facing and if the fence will be in a straight line or not. The commission members stated, for the record, that the details for the fence proposed for lot 1, will involve removing Ian Scott's fence (neighboring property located at 213 South Street), and that the new fence will be scalloped up to the 4' portion. Mr. Gaffney noted that because there was a lot of discussion between the two neighbors, it would be appropriate if the owner would submit to the commission a drawing of the actual design of the fencing so that the commission would have something on record. He added that if they were to come back with the drawings and agreements, the commission could go ahead and sign off to approve the application. Specifically, they would need to know from the drawing the direction the fence would be going, where it would face, and whose property it would land on.

12. Revision to permit #09-59, Thomas Corl and Mary Cotton, 206 N. Morris Street, request for revisions to change the roof line on previously approved permit application. Mr. Corl explained to the commission that the original drawings showed a three part telescoping effect with a high part in the front and dropping down about 2'. However, when the builder started to put on the addition the gap was only about 7 or 8 inches as opposed to the 2' as shown on the drawing. Mr. Corl stated that the contractor contacted him as he was framing the addition and said that it did not make sense to have a gap that small for the middle section of the house and that it would be an area where water and birds' nests would collect. The contractor then suggested that the owners have only two steps down so that the middle section would continue to extend along the existing ridge line and then drop down at the section of the garret. The new drawings show a 2 step as opposed to a 3 part telescope. Mrs. Stanley noted that the revised plans looked more pleasing as a streetscape. Mr. Corl added that almost all of this change was not easily seen from the front or sides and that one would have to stand on the neighbor's deck in order to get a good view of the addition. Mr. Corl then asked the commission if they would allow him to continue the ridgeline as revised. Ms. Litty then made a motion to accept the revision as presented. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and carried with all in favor. As an aside, Mr. Corl stated that during construction the builders had removed his fence and that he had saved the railings which he would like to put back with new posts on the property line. He asked if he would need a permit to put the fence back up in order for the commission to review. He was asked by the commission if he was planning to place the fence back in the same location. Mr. Corl responded, "yes." He was then told by the commission that he would not need a permit because what he was doing was repair work. Mr. Corl added that he just wanted to make sure the commission did not come back to him stating they had never seen the fence before.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby  
Assistant Clerk