

OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

DECEMBER 2, 2019

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the chairman, Thomas Costigan, on Monday, December 2, 2019, at 5:00 p.m., in the meeting room of the Oxford Community Services Building.

Other commission members in attendance were Suzanne Litty, James Deerin, Jennifer Stanley, Patricia Ingram, and Julie Wells.

The minutes of the meeting of October 7, 2019 were approved and accepted as distributed. No meeting took place in November.

The following building permits were reviewed by the commission:

1. Permit #19-81, Eleanor Nelson, 100 Norton Street, window replacement. Ms. Nelson explained to the commission that she had two (2) double hung windows on her house that both had rotted sashes and were in need of replacing. She noted that the replacement windows would be the exact size, 6 over 6 windows, made of the same materials as those that needed to be replaced. Mr. Deerin made a motion to approve the application for the two window replacements as described in the application. The motion was unanimously carried by all without further discussion.
2. 19-82, Town Park, LLC, 104 S. Morris Street, revision of originally approved access ramp and window and transom change at southern corner of storefront, made in consultation with the Maryland Historic Trust. Architect Charles Paul Goebel was present to discuss the application. He explained that in accordance with the MHT, the previously approved building plans had been revised to reduce and simplify the access ramp into the building, including the elimination of a side entrance into the building and making the ramp into a single story structure. The Morris Street façade will primarily stay the same. For now, the HVAC units will remain in their existing location, along the side of the building, but the fence enclosure in which they sit will be shortened. Mr. Deerin asked which of the drawings provided showed best the changes that were being proposed. Mr. Goebel referred the members to pages A3 and A4. Mr. Goebel noted that the porch would not differ but that the area in the front, where they was to be a picture window, has been changed to a non-functional door with a transom over it at the request of the MHC. The existing brick wainscoting will remain. Two bay windows will occupy the space in front of the building where bay windows had once been in the past. The planters in front of the building will become the foundation for the bays. Mr. Deerin made a motion that the commission approve the application to revise the originally approved plans for 104 S. Morris Street to include the reconstruction of the change to the access ramp, as shown on pages A3 and A4, dated 11/13/19, which show the new ramp, and secondly, to reduce the prominence and eliminate the related changes to the entry doors, stoops, and steps on the southside of the front elevation of the plans dated 11/13/19, shown on pages A3 and A4, which would include changing the dimension of what use to be a window which would appear to be more of a door

with an associated transom above it. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wells and unanimously carried with all in favor.

3. Permit #19-85, Thomas Baker, 217 South Street, rear enclosed porch (14' x 18') over portion of existing deck; redecking portion of existing deck. Mr. Baker explained to the commission that he was proposing to build an enclosed porch in the rear of his home by removing part of the deck and using the existing gable. He noted that he had had issues regarding the coverage but was working to bring it down to 40%. Mr. Deerin asked if this was more of a porch or an addition to the house. Mr. Baker responded that it would be more of a porch but that it would have a supplemental heating system with 6' casement windows all the way round it. The other portion of the deck would remain as a deck. However, Mr. Baker stated that it was starting to rot so he would have to rebuild it. Mr. Deerin pointed out that Mr. Baker's house was considered to be a non-contributing structure on the commission's list of significant historic houses because it was built around 1980. When asked about the exterior surface of the proposed porch, Mr. Baker responded that it would match the existing vinyl siding on the house. Mrs. Stanley asked how one would exit off from the deck. Mr. Baker responded that it would only be 1' off the ground but that there was a stair currently there. Mrs. Stanley stated that it would be nice to see the steps on the plan and asked about a handrail. Mr. Baker responded that because the deck is only a foot off the ground a handrail wasn't necessary. Mr. Costigan made a motion to approve the enclosed porch over a portion of the existing deck and reducing a portion of the existing deck with all trim, siding, and windows of the new porch to match the existing house. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wells and unanimously carried with all in favor.
4. Permit #19-86, Lucy Garliauskas, 102 N. Morris Street, installation of pergola over HVAC unit; new front railing affixed to porch post in front of house. Ms. Garliauskas discussed her plans to install handrails on her front steps that she was hoping to attach with a bracket which will be attached to a post on the left side of the steps. Her desire was to install just one rail to be made of cedar. The second issue pertained to her HVAC system along the side of her house. She explained to the members that when it snows, big clumps of snow sliding off of her roof fall into it. Her thought was that by having an open, slotted pergola over the system, it would provide additional protection and screening. Ms. Garliauskas presented examples of the type of pergola she was looking at installing, adding that the pergola would be located along the right side of her home (facing south), in the area behind the chimney. Ms. Litty noted that a drawing would be helpful. Mrs. Wells suggested that instead of having a pergola, roofing snow guards (also known as "snowbirds") might be just as effective. Ms. Litty again stated that the commission really needed to have a proper drawing attached to the permit of what the pergola would look like. Ms. Garliauskas agreed to providing the commission with one. Mr. Deerin asked if the HVAC unit was on a platform. Ms. Garliauskas responded that it was on a concrete platform. Mr. Deerin pointed out that Ms. Garliauskas' permit stated the pergola would be 10' tall from the ground level. Ms. Garliauskas responded she would need to correct that figure on her application as the pergola would actually be only about 4' above the HVAC units and would allow for full access. Mr. Deerin suggested it would be worth looking to the snowbird guards but that he did not have a problem with the pergola provided he could see a sketch showing the proper dimensions. Mrs. Stanley agreed with Mr. Deerin that she too would like to see a drawing. Mr. Costigan agreed with the others that a sketch was needed and that Ms. Garliauskas should speak with a roofer about the snowbirds. Mrs. Stanley made a motion that the commission approved the single handrail on the front of the house at 102 N. Morris Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried with all in favor. Ms. Garliauskas asked the members that if she does decide to go with the snowbirds instead of pursuing the pergola, would she have to come back before the commission for approval on that.

The members all agreed that she would not have to return for approval with Chairman Costigan adding that he hoped that would do the trick.

This ended the review of building permits.

CONSULTATION

A consultation was held with Walter Patton, property owner of the lot at 101 Tilghman Street, to discuss his thoughts for placing a house on his property. He explained that he purchased the lot back in 1998, that a house had been on the property prior to his purchase of it, and that in 1998 he had gotten a variance on the building setbacks because of the configuration of the lot which is 100' wide by 50' deep. Mr. Patton added that he has been trying to sell his lot with no luck and thought he would have a better chance of selling it if he could get an approved set of building plans that he could show a potential buyer. Mr. Patton presented his concept plan to the members explaining that the landing and steps would be outside the frontyard setback line. A back door would be behind a screened-in porch that would lead into a utility room. The house itself would be raised at least 5' off from the ground like that of his neighbor's home located directly behind Mr. Patton's property. Appearance wise, the house would have cedar shake gray vinyl siding with wide trim on the corner. The house plans would be drawn up by the same company that submitted the plans for Mr. Patton's neighbor in the rear of the property at 103 Tilghman Street. Mr. Deerin noted that the biggest challenge would be the height of the house. Mr. Patton stated that his objective in meeting with the HDC was to get a general consensus that the basic appearance of the house he had chosen would work and that he could put the landing and steps outside the footprint. Chairman Costigan responded that Mr. Patton could look to the HDC for aesthetic approval but that the landing was something Planning would need to address. Overall, the commission members felt that what Mr. Patton had presented looked to be attractive and would be harmonious with the house behind him at 103 Tilghman Street. Mr. Deerin suggested that Mr. Patton might want to consider shutters.

Prior to adjourning Chairman Costigan stated that the next meeting would be on Monday, January 6, 2020.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby
Assistant Clerk