

## **OXFORD PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **MINUTES**

**MARCH 1, 2016**

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Planning Commission was called to order by the chairman, David Baker, on Tuesday, March 1, 2016 at 7:00 p.m., in the meeting room of the Oxford Community Services Building.

Other commission members present were Edwin Miller and Stephen Mroczek. Also in attendance was Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer Cheryl Lewis.

The minutes of the meeting of December 1, 2015 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following building permit was reviewed by the commission:

Permit #16-04, Benson and Mangold, LLC, 220 N. Morris Street, attach a sign to the Tilghman Street side of the Benson and Mangold office. Real estate agent Ray Stevens was present to discuss the application. Mr. Stevens explained that the proposed sign would be placed along the side of the building which faces Tilghman Street. Currently there is a display case along this side of the building. Mr. Stevens asked if the agency could have both the proposed new sign and keep the display case. Mr. Baker expressed concerns as the Oxford Zoning Ordinance does not allow for two (2) business signs on one location. Mr. Mroczek asked that if the display case had nothing but properties for sale in it, without any signage, would it still be considered a sign. Mr. Baker responded that within the zoning ordinance the display case would still fall within the definition of a sign. Administrator Lewis suggested that the owners consider reworking the size of the display case to have the same width as the proposed sign and to meld the two together in order to create one overall sign/display unit. Mr. Stevens agreed to look into that and to meet with the commission after seeing what changes the real estate office would be willing to make. Mr. Baker noted that the way the Planning Commission was reading the ordinance was that one could have an attached sign on the front of the building and one sign attached on the side – both up to 20 square feet. Mr. Miller made a motion that the commission approve the request to have a sign that is a combination of the existing display case and the sign as presented at this meeting on the side of the building facing Tilghman Street as long as there are not changes made by the HDC. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mroczek and unanimously carried with all in favor.

This concluded the review of building permits.

### **REQUEST FOR LOT LINE REVISION**

A request for a lot line revision was received from Charlotte Roberts, property owner of 104 Willows Avenue. Ms. Roberts was represented by local real estate agent Ray Stevens. Mr. Stevens explained that Ms. Roberts property is such that it faces both Willows Avenue and Riverview Avenue. There are two buildings on the property. One is dilapidated. Mr. Stevens noted that Ms. Roberts had asked him to look at the smaller building on the property and to determine that if she took it down would it increase the value of her property. He told her that it would but this brought up the question that if she were to take it down, could she build another one on the same footprint. Mr. Stevens was not sure if this could

be done or not. Ms. Roberts' lot is approximately 14,000 sq. ft. Ms. Roberts questioned whether or not she could subdivide the lot or make a lot line revision. Mr. Stevens thought the answer would be "no" as she would need at least 10,000 sq. ft. for each lot. However, Mr. Stevens was told by Ms. Roberts that some time ago she made a presentation to the Planning Commission with her attorney whereby they stated that her lot had a deed in which it was described as being 2 parcels. Mr. Stevens stated that his purpose for meeting with the commission was to find out if it was possible or not to divide this property. He added that a copy of some older Planning Commission minutes indicated Ms. Roberts' attorney was going to research the deed and come back to the Planning Commission if he thought there was a chance that it could be divided into two lots. Mr. Stevens guess was that the attorney read the regulations and found out that it could not be done. Mr. Baker concluded that this was correct. He added that the two lots, Lots 10 and 11, had, at one time, had a total of 26,000 sq. ft. However, in 1989, the person that owned these two lots deeded off 10,000 sq. ft., bringing the total down to less than 20,000 sq. ft. per lot. As per the ordinance, the Planning Commission cannot divide any property less than 20,000 sq. ft. However, if Ms. Roberts wants to demolish the dilapidated building on her property, Mr. Baker did not think she would have a problem getting a permit for that. Mr. Miller asked how it came to be that there were two primary structures on the lot. Administrator Lewis responded that when the property was annexed into town the older building was already there. The owner, Ms. Roberts, requested to build a new house and kept the existing building to be used as a guesthouse. Mr. Stevens stated he would encourage Ms. Roberts to take the older building down. Mr. Mroczek made a motion to deny the request to subdivide the lot. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miller and unanimously carried with all in favor.

Schuyler Benson met with the commission to discuss the possibility of a lot line revision on his property at 101 Bayview Avenue. He and his neighbor to the side at 805 S. Morris Street (a corner lot) share a side line and rear access off an alley. Mr. Benson stated he wanted to do a lot line revision between himself and his neighbors (Mr. Gibbs) property on the southeast corner which would involve moving part of the side property line 8 ft. over towards Mr. Gibbs property. This would actually result in restoring a portion of Mr. Benson's original property line dated 2005. The line change would result in giving Mr. Benson an additional 230 sq. ft. The change would not create a problem with the impervious surface coverage allowed on either property. The purpose of the request is to get some land back in order to create an area within Mr. Benson's yard that would allow for his family to plan on having some type of structure that would provide for them some privacy space. The reason why the requested lot line revision can only be a portion of the side yard lot line is because if the line change were to go the entire length of the side of the property, it would make Mr. Gibbs' house non-conforming by putting his house outside the required 25' rear yard setback. The consensus of the commission was that the request would be acceptable and that Mr. Benson should go ahead and get his revision plans ready to present to the commission at their next meeting.

## **TIME CHANGE**

Administrator Lewis asked the commission if they would be willing to change their meeting time to begin at 6 p.m. instead of 7. The request was well received. Mr. Miller made a motion that beginning with the April 2016 meeting that the formal meeting time be changed to 6 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mroczek and unanimously carried with all in favor.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

Administrator Lewis reminded the commission members that there was a public meeting scheduled for Saturday, March 12, at 11:00 a.m. at the Oxford Fire House to discuss the acquisition of The Mews property by the town. She also mentioned that she was in the process of applying for a grant through the heritage area for the installation an audio tour of the town. This would involve having environmental friendly boxes installed throughout town that would be either solar powered or hand powered by visitors though a system which would give a brief history describing the location in which the box was placed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby  
Assistant Clerk