

OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

APRIL 2, 2018

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the chairman, Thomas Costigan, on Monday, April 2, 2018, in the meeting room of the Oxford Community Services Building, at 5:00 p.m.

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

The minutes of the meeting of March 5, 2018 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following permits were reviewed by the commission:

1. Permit #18-12, Oxford Library, 103 Market Street, remove existing roof covering; replace plywood as needed; install underlayment and shingles; shingle replacement will match existing. Mr. Costigan noted that the work had already done, possibly because the library's roof was heavily damaged by a recent wind storm that had recently passed through town. The new roofing material used was in keeping with what had previously been on the building. A motion was made by Mrs. Ingram to approve the application with all in favor.
2. Permit #18-17, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Silverman, 228 S. Morris Street, demolish old porch decking and install new Azek decking. No one was present to discuss the application. Mr. Costigan explained that he had looked at the porch and found that it did have serious rot issues. The contractor knows he needs to remove the decking and replace it but he may find that the posts have rotted which means they will have to be replaced as well. Ms. Litty noted that the porch sits back off the street and is not really all that visible. A motion was made by Mrs. Stanley to approve the request to demolish the old porch and replace it with Azek decking. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.
3. Permit #18-18, Ward Bucher and Lisa Johnson, 208 Tilghman Street, replace shingle on main house with Certainteed Landmark Pro, Weather Wood color. No one was present to discuss the application. Mr. Costigan stated that in looking over the application it wasn't clear if the couple wanted to replace the entire roof on their house or just parts of it and therefore he was not sure what they were asking approval for. Mr. Deerin added that in looking at the building he couldn't tell what was damaged and what was not as the roof could not be seen clearly from the street. Mr. Costigan noted that a simple repair job would not need an application. Mr. Deerin made a motion stating that a simple patch job would not require commission actions but the commission would need clarification as to whether the work was repair and patch or replacing and that he would approve the permit knowing the color is the same as it is now. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried. Mr. Costigan stated he would come to the town office to sign off on the application once it has been clarified.
4. Permit #18-19, Mary Jordan and Curt Reintsma, 210 S. Morris Street, repair and restore; paint shutters and front door Satin Black; replace main roof and match shingles with existing side roofs (garage, etc.), replace front porch roof with copper roof. Ms. Litty recused herself from the meeting in order to represent Ms. Jordan and Mr. Reintsma. Questions were raised as to

what section of the house was considered as having the main roof. In looking over the cost estimates, Mr. Costigan stated the cost given could apply to the whole roof or it could just be the cost for a new copper roof. Ms. Litty noted that the couple's roofer had said he was not replacing the whole roof. Mr. Costigan pointed out that the application called for replacing the main roof and matching the shingles with the existing side roofs. Mr. Deerin questioned what the roofing material was on the side roofs of the house. Mr. Costigan asked the group how they felt about the use of a copper roof on the house. Mr. Deerin questioned if there were any other copper roofs in town. Mrs. Stanley thought there were but that they had all turned green and that the commission needed to have more clarification as to the roofing requests. Mr. Costigan felt that the only thing the commission could rule on was the request for the painting of the black shutters as no one understood the request to paint the front door if the front door was going to be eventually moved from its present location. He added that the commission needed someone before them who could answer all their questions properly. Mr. Deerin made a motion to approve the painting of the shutters to be black, as shown on the color sample submitted to the commission. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor. The commission next addressed a consultation letter that had been provided by Ms. Jordan. Ms. Jordan asked the commission to consider her request to move her front door (currently located off to the side of her house) to the center of her house, located under the middle of 3 windows located overhead. Mr. Costigan thought that the request made sense as his thought was that that was where the front door was originally located. He asked Ms. Litty if the current location of the front door would be closed. Ms. Litty responded that it would go away. All the members looked favorably on the request. The other request involved putting a brick façade in the areas of the house that currently feature vinyl siding. Questions were raised as to what was under the vinyl siding. Mr. Costigan pointed out there were many architectural styles at play on this house and asked the commission members how they felt about a total brick façade facing on Morris Street or just leaving the vinyl siding as it is or replacing it with a suitable clapboard siding to show it was the original part of the house. Mrs. Stanley thought the group should take a look at the house together. Ms. Litty asked if the commission could at least let Ms. Jordan know if they would look favorably on her request to move the front door to the center of the house. Mr. Deerin thought it was a reasonable thing to do, as did the other commission members. However, the commission was unable to decide on the request for the brick work but did agree that it would be beneficial to look at the house together. Ms. Jordan also asked the commission to consider some window changes that she was proposing and offered two options for the commission to review. Mr. Deerin stated that his feeling was that the 6 over 6 windows looked much better, as did the other members of the group. To recap, the commission members were all in agreement that the movement of the front door to the center of the house would be fine. They did question the use of brick where the existing siding is currently located on the house, and they all liked the consistency of the 6 over 6 windows (labeled as "alternative elevation 2), the roofing questions they needed more answers to, and, with regards to the copper roofing, the commission did not want to see her use a copper roof with some kind of film on it that will maintain the brightness of the copper...that it needs to be dull and eventually turn to verdigris.

5. Permit #18-15, Jennifer Stanley, 221 South St., demolish 1917 2-story kitchen addition; construct new addition to include elevator, enlarged kitchen, second floor master bedroom accessible by stairs and elevator and new pervious deck facing water. Mrs. Stanley recused herself from the meeting to discuss her application along with her architect, Philip Logan. Mrs. Stanley explained that aging in her house, Maplehurst, was a problem and that she needed to come up with a solution that would allow her to stay there. Mr. Logan spoke stating there were

many unique features to the house that they didn't want to lose and were working to rebuild within the existing envelope of that portion of the house they were planning to remove. The addition would be a two-story addition to the north, along the same side as Mrs. Stanley's existing garage. The new addition would incorporate a side entrance with a covered porch. The addition would not extend out towards the street. The roof to the new addition would be given a pitch that would be green with an anodized finish. The back patio would be changed into decking and the deck would become a terrace accessible from the house. The addition would be stepped back from the main house. Mr. Costigan asked about the window over the entry door as shown on page A200 (west elevation) and asked if that was a different type of window in that location. Mr. Logan responded that it was and that it was a fixed window located over the stairway. All the other windows within the new addition would be standard double hung windows except for a window facing the water in the kitchen. These new windows would match the existing smaller windows that are located within the existing addition to Maplehurst that is planned for demolition. Mr. Deerin asked if these proposed windows were smaller than the existing windows in main house. Mr. Logan responded that they were and that they wanted to keep them smaller because they wanted to separate out the addition in order to reinforce the main portion of the home's historic features and to show the addition as a service wing. The plans also call for the use of clapboard siding for the new section. New Hardie board would match the color of the existing house which has wood shingles stained "blue stone". Mr. Costigan asked if new shutters would be placed on the addition. Mr. Logan responded that the plans do not call for any shutters to be used on the addition's south street facing side because of the odd placement of the windows and different shapes. Mr. Logan added that the plans call for a continuous line that wraps around the house. The addition would replicate many of the details of the main house such as the soffits, crown molding, reveals, etc., as shown on page A300 of the plans. Mr. Deerin stated that going to clapboard on the new addition from the shingles used on the main house bothered him as he thought the look would be a little bit jarring. Ms. Litty agreed with Mr. Deerin stating that she thought it would look so much more different from the main house. Mr. Costigan noted that from a preservation standpoint Mr. Logan was correct in not wanting to replicate the historic main part of the house but he also felt Mr. Deerin and Ms. Litty were correct too from an aesthetic point of view. He questioned whether or not Mrs. Stanley and Mr. Logan really wanted the addition to look so differently. Mr. Deerin thought the difference would be especially noticeable coming up South Street. Ms. Litty pointed out that the garage, near the addition, already had a shingle siding that matched the main house. Mrs. Stanley responded that she had no problem with covering the addition with shingles as opposed to clapboard. Mrs. Ingram stated she would like to see shingle used throughout. Mr. Deerin added that he liked the concept with the proposed deck on the back. In looking over the windows, Ms. Litty commented on the use of 3 raised panels used to separate a series of windows on the new addition and that she thought they looked too contemporary. Mr. Logan stated those could be removed and questioned if he would have to resubmit new plans showing that the panels have been removed. Mr. Costigan responded that would not be necessary and that the commission could still give their approval based on their reference for the siding change along with a note stating the panels would not be used on each set of plans. When questioned about HVAC units, Mr. Logan responded that there would not be any additional outside HVAC units. He also noted that the deck would be built using Epay and would be less than 30" off the ground. Mr. Deerin made a motion to approve the plans for the new addition on the north side of the existing house including demolition of the existing addition to be replaced with a new addition in accordance with the plans with the exception that the new addition will be clad in shingle to match the existing house shingles rather than the Hardi

clapboard siding shown in the plans, along with the removal of the raised panels on the east elevation that separates the 6 new windows on the addition. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried with all in favor.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby
Assistant Clerk