

OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 10, 2018

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the chairman, Thomas Costigan, on Monday, September 10, 2018, at 5:00 p.m., in the meeting room of the Oxford Community Services Center.

Other commission members in attendance were Patricia Ingram, James Deerin, and new commission member Julianne Wells.

The minutes of July 9, 2018 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following building permits were reviewed by the commission:

Permit #18-59, Mitchell Nathanson, 400 E. Strand, one room, one story addition on existing deck; all exterior to match existing. Mr. and Mrs. Nathanson were present to discuss the application. Mr. Nathanson explained that the proposed addition would be placed over an existing deck attached to the house. The new addition would be a one story, 16' x 21' in size, with the new roofing following the same pitch as the existing roof, along with casement windows to match the other casement windows already found in the house. Mr. Nathanson explained that currently his existing water pipes run through the wall facing his open deck that is exposed to the weather and heavy winds that come off the water from The Strand. The hope is that the new addition would protect those pipes along with providing a downstairs bedroom. Most of the home's existing deck will be taken up by the new addition. The addition will be covered in the same vinyl cedar shake style siding that the house currently has. Mr. Deerin pointed out that the Nathanson's house was listed as a contributing structure built back in 1890 and described as a two bay shingle frame house. Mr. Deerin asked about the back of the house. Mr. Nathanson stated the the back was primarily a blank wall with just a door and having the same siding as the rest of the house. The addition will have a door and two windows. An existing door will be relocated into the new addition. Mr. Nathanson confirmed that he was no longer planning to install and build the fireplace and chimney that were shown in the building plans. Mr. Costigan asked if the existing window treatment on either side of the door would mirror the new treatment on the front of the addition. Mr. Nathanson responded that it would. Mr. Nathanson also noted that the heron sculpture he currently has attached to his would be moved and placed on outside wall of the new addition. To confirm, it was stated that the windows on the Mill Street side would be casements along with two windows on the front of the house, and that one door would be a rescue of the existing kitchen door along with one new door which would match the reused door, both of which would be Anderson glass doors. Mr. Deerin made a motion to approve the request for the addition on 400 E. Strand per the drawings that the applicant submitted with the exception that there will be no fireplace or chimney as currently shown on the drawings. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried

September 10, 2018

Page 2

with all in favor. Mr. Costigan reminded Mr. Nathanson that should he decide to put in a new a/c unit, he would need to let the town office know.

Permit #18-58, Linda Taffe, 307 S. Morris Street, accessory building door. Mr. Costigan noted that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting but that the request was fairly simple. He explained that Ms. Taffe has an existing accessory structure which has a sliding barn door attached to it. Her desire is to place a sliding glass door behind the barn door so that she can utilize the shed in the winter. The glass door would not be noticeable when the building is not in use as the barn door would hide it. Mr. Deerin stated he did not have a problem with the request. Mr. Costigan agreed. Mr. Costigan made a motion to approve the sliding glass door at Morris Street. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried by all in favor.

Permit #18-57, Mr. and Mrs. Ray Nissen, 224 S. Morris Street, interior remodel; replace door and windows at rear to create sunroom and improve access to add new master bath and laundry on second floor. The applicants were represented by their agent, Leland Weldon, who explained to the commission members that the project consisted primarily of interior changes involving the widening of the rooms and updating the house to make it more livable. The main points for consideration included the reconfiguration of the house, a new single awning window on the second floor on the left side of the house as noted on page EC1, and relocation of furnace shed door in order to make the shed a mud room. Mr. Weldon noted that the house contained a double sided fireplace that has several problems and is not efficient. The owners are looking to remove it along with a chimney. Mr. Costigan asked about the deck located on the back of the house. Mr. Weldon replied that the deck would not change although the railings may have to be replaced to meet the building code. Mrs. Wells asked if the existing windows were going to be repaired. Mr. Weldon responded that they were and that they were not being replacing. Mr. Weldon also noted that the owners were planning to remove the home's hot water baseboard heat. Mr. Costigan reminded Mr. Weldon that he would need to notify the town office should any outside heating or cooling units be added onto the property. Mr. Deerin asked about the existing windows in the house and was told that they were double hung windows with sash weights. Mr. Deerin noted that the plans showed the removal of two second story windows on the left side elevation, to be replaced with smaller awning crank windows on the second floor and a smaller window on the first floor. Mr. Weldon responded that in the location where the kitchen was going to be relocated there would be a new double hung 2 over 2 windows. Mr. Deerin informed Mr. Weldon that the historic commission needed detailed information on all the windows that the applicant was planning on replacing, such as specifications and the type of replacement windows. Mr. Weldon stated that the replacements would have the same appearance as the windows found on the front of the house and that the new windows would be wood. Mr. Deerin responded that whatever approval the commission gave at this night's meeting would be conditioned upon the applicant or representative coming back before the HDC with specifications on the doors and windows that they are planning on installing. Mr. Weldon/ asked if the commission would have any problems with the request to remove the brick chimney located in the center of the house. It was noted that based on the guidelines, the owner

September 10, 2018

Page 3

should try to preserve the chimney. Mr. Deerin again reiterated that specific details on each of the windows, doors, and construction needed to be presented to the commission as well as which elements were remaining the same and which were changing. Mrs. Wells asked what the step-out from the house might look like. Mr. Weldon responded that the owners were considering options from a landscaper and that he thought they would be keeping the existing brick walk that is already there on the property. Mr. Costigan asked if anyone knew what was under the siding. Mr. Weldon responded that he wasn't sure but that the owners were not planning on changing the siding as it exists now. Because of the questions raised at the meeting by the commission members, Mr. Costigan stated that no motion on the application would be given at this meeting and that he was considering this meeting as a consultation. He asked that Mr. Weldon come back to the commission with more detailed information so that the application could be approved at a future meeting.

This concluded the review of building permit applications.

A consultation was held with local realtor, Chuck Mangold, with regards to the property located at 200 West Street. Mr. Mangold stated that he had a client interested in the property who wanted to know if the commission would be open to seeing the use of Tezla solar roofing placed on the house. Mr. Mangold supplied the commission with information on the product noting that the solar panels are located within the roof shingles themselves. Mr. Costigan stated that this was something the commission has wanted to see for years and that it was wonderful that this type of shingle is now commercially available. Mr. Mangold added that from the street the shingles all look the same and asked again if the commission would be ok with a request for the use of this type of shingle as his client wanted to live in the historic district. Questions were raised as to whether there were batteries or cabling used in making the shingles operational. Mr. Mangold pointed out that the information provided showed what the batteries looked like and that that they could be placed inside or outside. Mr. Deerin noted that he had spoken with a gentleman who lived out in Utah that had this type of shingle and that his comment was that the solar terra cotta shingles and solar slate shingles looked great but that the asphalt shingles were not as appealing. In general, the members thought that if historic homes were looking to use solar power, this would be a good direction to look into, keeping in mind that some shingles look good and others do not. The commission agreed with Mr. Mangold who stated that as long as the shingle chosen mimicked an historic building, such as slate, the commission would be good with that.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby
Assistant Clerk