

OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

JUNE 1, 2020

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Thomas Costigan, on Monday, June 1, 2020, at 5:00 p.m., via "Zoom" due to the on-going pandemic of a virus known as Covid-19.

Other members participating in the virtual meeting included members James Deerin, Suzanne Litty, Jennifer Stanley, Patricia Ingram, and Julie Wells. Also in attendance was Town Administrator Cheryl Lewis.

The minutes of the meeting of February 3, 2020 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following building permits were reviewed by the commission:

1. Permit #20-15, Robert Konopacz, 206 S. Morris Street, remove existing roof surface and install new underlayment and solar roof tiles. Prior to the onset of the meeting, word had been received at the town office that the property owner did not want to move forward with this application at this time and therefore it was not reviewed.
2. Permit # 20-19, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Konopacz, 206 S. Morris Street, renovate and expand on existing foundation a garage apartment into a studio. Mr. and Mrs. Konopacz were represented by their residential designer, Timothy Kearns, who was virtually present at the meeting. Mr. Kearns explained to the members that the exterior shape of the Konopacz's existing garage would primarily remain the same as it currently exists. A small bay addition would be added to the southside of the building that would be mostly all glass. The exterior trims would be Azek, the roofing would be composite shingless, and the installed new windows would be simulated divided light and painted white. Mr. Kearns added that the plan was to limit the disturbance to the existing building. In looking over the application, Mr. Deerin asked if the shed on the back of the garage would be demolished and replaced with a structure that would be extended so as to create a story and a half but would remain within the same footprint as to where the shed is now. Mr. Kearns responded that was correct and that it also included a bay structure to be added to the southside of the newly replaced structure. When questioned about the siding, Mr. Kearns responded that the building would have Hardie plank siding painted white with the Azek trim having the same coloration. Mrs. Stanley asked if there was a stoop leading up to the entrance door. Mr. Kearns responded that there was but it would only be out about 8" at the most. Mr. Costigan asked about the access into the studio. Mr. Kearns responded that the entrance was at the man door on the side of the building. The garage doors would remain on the building but they would become non-operable. Mrs. Wells asked if the garage doors would remain the same in their appearance. Mr. Kearns responded that the plan was to maintain them but if they needed to be replaced, they would be built up doors made out of Azek and would look like the ones they were replacing. It was stated that there would only be one access door leading into the building. A question was raised as to whether or not the building would have air conditioning. Mr. Kearns responded that it probably would and that a Mitsubishi unit would be installed high up on the north facing wall. When questioned about the use of the brick

vener, Mr. Kearns stated that it would be attached to the existing block of the accessory building and would be purely decorative. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to approve the plans for 206 S. Morris Street to renovate and expand on the existing foundation of a garage apartment into a studio. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.

3. Permit #20-21, Rachel Lombara, 309 Tilghman Street, relocate existing yard shed; relocate and reconfigure gravel drive; replace and reconfigure existing wood fence with white aluminum with puppy pickets. The application was represented by residential designer Timothy Kearns who explained that the existing conditions on this property were very wet. Currently, half of this property's parking pad is located in the front yard and the owner is looking to move it more towards the rear of the property. The existing gravel would be moved/relocated to create the new parking area. The brick on the property would remain. The owner is also requesting to move an existing shed further back into the corner of the NW side of the property and to replace the existing wood picket fence with white aluminum fencing with squared channels that would have puppy pickets in order to keep her dogs safely within the fence. The new fence would be on the same footprint as the existing fence. The overall height of the fencing would be 4'. The 6' wooden privacy fence, in the back of the property, would remain where it is. Two style choices were provided by the owner so that the HDC could choose which style fencing they liked the best. Mrs. Wells commented that it would be a great improvement to this property in having the driveway space in the back and the shed moved into the new location as it would open up the property. Mrs. Stanley asked the members what they thought about the color fencing the owner was requesting. Mrs. Litty point out that traditionally iron fences in town are black. Chairman Costigan noted that a white metal fence was going to jump out and that he believed the commission would prefer it be black. Mr. Kearns responded that he did not think that there would be a problem with changing the color of the fence from white to black but if there was an issue with it, he would come back before the commission. The commission members, in looking over the proposed 2 choices for the fence design, all agreed that the fencing labeled as "Wavecrest" would be the one most suitable and chose that design for the applicant to use. Ms. Litty made a motion to approve the fence, to be black in color, using the Wavecrest style, with puppy pickets, along with the relocation of the existing yard shed as shown the drawing and relocation and reconfiguration of the driveway. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.
4. Permit #20-22, Jennifer Coyle, 108 E. Strand, replace and reconfigure existing porch posts with pair of 6x6 structural fiberglass posts painted white; expand rear stoops to pervious deck system with code compliant rail system with wood to be painted white; add retractable awning on rear façade. The application was presented by residential designer Timothy Kearns. Mr. Kearns explained that the owner wanted to change the style of her porch posts from 4" round Victorian posts to 6x6 paired structural fiberglass posts. The existing railing on the porch would be removed on the side of the porch facing onto the Strand but would remain on the east and north sides. A new open spaced deck along the back of the house is also being requested which would have two sets of transitioning steps leading up to it. Presently there is an area of brick pavers in the backyard area that the owner would like to remove in order to create some pervious surface. The owner is currently in the process of having a survey drawn up in order to have the coverage calculations on the property. In order to make the new deck more useful, a retractable cloth awning is also being requested that would not be visible from the public way. The railing on the east side of the house would remain and new porch railing installed to the new back deck. It was noted that by code there would need to be railing for the back deck whereas in the front, it is low enough that it does not require any railing. Mr. Deerin asked if

the owners were planning to remove a portico that sticks out in the back of the house. Mr. Kearns responded that they were in order to allow for the placement of the awning. Questions were raised as to whether or not the owners had thought about doing single posts instead of paired posts. Mr. Kearns responded that single posts would be thin and would not balance the mass of the big roof above but that the interior designer and owner had more to do with the choice of the posts and added that there was another front porch in town, located at 206 Morris Street, which had double posts like those being requested by the Ms. Coyle. Both Chairman Costigan and Mrs. Wells expressed their displeasure over the choice of posts. Mr. Deerin, however, pointed up that the house itself was non-contributing, historically speaking, and that he did not mind the double posts. Mrs. Ingram agreed and added that she found them to be an interesting choice. Mr. Deerin made a motion that the HDC approve the replacement and reconfiguration of the existing porch posts with pairs of 6x6 structural fiberglass posts painted white, along with the expansion of the rear steps to open decks with code compliant railing systems, using Trex or an equal product, along with an additional retractable awning on the rear façade. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and carried with the following vote: Chairman Costigan – nay, Mr. Deerin - yay, Mrs. Stanley - yay, and Mrs. Ingram – yay (Mrs. Wells, who is the alternate, did not participate in the vote).

5. Permit #20-28, Analipsi, LLC, 200 West Street, amendment to permit #19-50A requesting a reduced setback from 25' to 3' facing onto West Street; reduced setback will allow for shore front and street front to be comparable to setback of shore fronts and street fronts of neighboring properties and structure. Along with the property owner, architect Christine Dayton and Sean Callahan, Senior Planner at Lane Engineering, LLC were virtually present to discuss the application. Ms. Dayton explained that the owner was approved and given a permit to build a new guesthouse/accessory structure. However, in looking over the southerly view from the corner of West and W. Division Street, the two homes on this street have their garages forward from their primary structures so that by moving the Analipsi accessory building closer to the street, it would be keeping in line with the street fronts of the neighboring properties and their structures. Chairman Costigan asked if the previously approved accessory building would be changing in any other way. Ms. Dayton confirmed that it would not and that the request was just a matter of location. Mr. Callahan referred to Section 32.10 of the Oxford Zoning Ordinance which states that "in all districts on streets or shore fronts where existing buildings and structures create a clearly defined setback line, a new building may be located in such a manner as to preserve the existing building setback line, even though such building may not provide for the full yard required herein." He also presented an aerial view of the Analipsi property and the neighboring houses in order for a better understanding of why the change was being requested. Mr. Deerin agreed that it made better sense to have the building relocated so that it would line up with the neighboring property belonging to Al Smith. Mr. Callahan agreed stating that it seemed to be a nice transition down from the northern part of West Street to the Smith property. Chairman Costigan asked about a brick sidewalk shown on the plans that appeared to be leading to nowhere. Ms. Dayton responded that it incorporated the front walkway into the house and that though the photo provided showed the edge of the brick as being raised next to a grass strip, the new sidewalk would maintain the pattern as shown in the photo but would not be raised so as not to create a tripping hazard. She added that she thought it would be a nice addition for the people walking in that vicinity to get to the small park area owned by the town. Chairman Costigan asked if the owner was planning on using Oxford picket fencing next to the sidewalk in question. Ms. Dayton responded that was correct and that he would basically have two layers of fencing – one back adjacent to the house and one up along the street. Mrs. Wells

asked if the size of the swimming pool was changing. Ms. Dayton responded that it was still in the design phase but that it would meet the town code. It would also be aligned with the back porch of the existing house so as to maintain that line on the waterside. She added that because of mitigation, there would be a lot of landscaping taking place. Mr. Deerin made a motion regarding 200 West Street to amend the existing permit to reduce the setback from 25' to 3' and to allow the construction of a brick sidewalk as shown on the drawings from one end of the property to the other. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Litty and unanimously carried with all in favor.

This concluded the review of building permits.

Chairman Costigan asked Administrator Lewis if the Analipsi, LLC request would be going before the Planning Commission for review and if the revision would need a variance. Administrator Lewis responded that the Planning Commission could use the code that Mr. Callahan had referred to and that the Planning Commission had the option of approving the request without the need for a variance, if they were to choose to do so. Mr. Deerin commented that the revised change made sense to be closer to the street and to be kept away from the Buffer. Administrator Lewis added that in this case West Street was more of an alley than a residential street with types of these structures being closer to the street, like other similar areas in town.

Chairman Costigan closed the meeting by reminding the commission that the next meeting would be taking place on Monday, July 6th. Administrator Lewis asked if the commission was ok with having another virtual meeting next month as she would like to continue the process for a little longer. Chairman Costigan responded that he couldn't see changing it now and that the new process was working.

There being no further business, Mr. Deerin made a motion to leave "Zoom." The motion was seconded and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby
Assistant Clerk