

## OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

### MINUTES

FEBRUARY 1, 2021

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Thomas Costigan, on Monday, February 1, 2021, 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 James Deerin, Suzanne Litty, Jennifer Stanley, Patricia Ingram, and Julie Wells. Also present was Town Manager Cheryl Lewis.

The minutes of October 5, 2020 and December 7, 2020 were approved and accepted as distributed. No meeting was held in January 2021.

The following building permits were reviewed by the commission:

1. Permit #21-05, Caroline Benson, 305 N. Morris Street, repair and replace an existing screened porch with modern screen windows and screening combination to provide insulation and air flow; replace wood floor with wood flooring. Mrs. Benson was virtually present to discuss the application and explained that her plan was to install glass windows in her existing porch at 305 N. Morris Street. The opening for the placement of the windows would remain the same. The porch foundation would be strengthened and the porch floor leveled. Mr. Deerin asked if the new windows would be upper and lower casement windows. Mrs. Benson responded that the bottom would be canopied so that one could still have air flow with the top being typical casement windows with panes. Mrs. Benson added that the porch would not be seen from a straight on view from the street and that the footprint of the porch would not change. Ms. Litty made a motion to approve the porch at 305 N. Morris Street as presented to the commission. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor.
2. Permit #21-06, Bruce Purdy and Barrett Shepard, 304 E. Strand, new 96 sq. ft. shed on side yard in the rear of the house. Mr. Purdy, who was virtually present at the meeting, explained to the commission that his request was to install an 8' x 12' accessory building at the SE corner of his property, 1' off the ground, and 2' off the property line. The plan calls to have it constructed to be a replicate of the house with black shutters and wood cedar shake siding. Mr. Deerin asked if it would have siding or shingles. Mr. Purdy responded that it would be siding with an asphalt roof along with having windows. No further questions were forthcoming. Mr. Deerin made a motion that the commission approve the construction of a 96 sq. ft. shed on the side of the property at 304 E. Strand. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried without further discussion.
3. Permit #21-07, Bruce Purdy and Barrett Shepard, 304 e. Strand, repair sunken brick walkways, build cedar deck at location of existing hazardous brick patio to avoid trip hazard and damage to root structure of trees. Chairman Costigan pointed out that the front walkway request looked to be more of a repair type of situation. Mr. Purdy responded that the walkway was very uneven and that the plan was to repair it to avoid tripping on it and make it look more handsome. Chairman Costigan again stated that would fall under maintenance. Mr. Deerin asked if the configuration of said walkway was going to change. Mr. Purdy responded that currently it has an "L/T" shape to it but that his plan was to change it slightly and reduce it. He noted that he and

his partner planned on redoing the brick from the driveway to the front walkway and keeping the front walkway as it is but eliminating a section of the bricks to the right side of the house. The members of the commission were all agreeable that this work would just fall under maintenance. Mr. Purdy next explained that currently there is a brick patio on the right hand side of his house that leads off from the kitchen that has sunk along with having tree root issues that have upended many of the bricks. He pointed out that this too was difficult to walk on and that he was looking to replace the 405 sq. ft. patio with a 530 sq. ft. deck that would be placed over the top of the existing patio. Stairs would come off the deck that would create an exit leading to the back garden. The deck would be cedar. Mr. Purdy added that he did not believe the deck would be able to be seen from the street as his plan was to add shrubbery on the property in order to block the view of the deck. Mrs. Wells asked if the existing iron fence on the property would be replaced. Mr. Purdy responded that it would not and that his plan was to repair it and paint it black. Chairman Costigan about the site plan provided that showed an elevation for the deck at 4.75' and asked if that elevation was from sea level. Mr. Purdy responded that was correct and that the deck itself would be just a couple of inches off the ground. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to approve the plans for a deck at 304 E. Strand. Mr. Deerin added to the motion the inclusion of the reconfiguration of the walk. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried without further discussion.

4. Permit #21-08, Bruce Purdy and Barrett Shepard, 304 E. Strand, removal of an existing plywood breezeway and aluminum screened door on left side of house; remove interior wall. Prior to the start of the review of the application, Chairman Costigan gave a disclaimer stating that he and Mr. Purdy had met on Saturday, January 30, and discussed this application as to what should now be considered a vestibule instead of a breezeway and that the purpose of the meeting was to assist Chairman Costigan in understanding exactly what it was that Mr. Purdy was wanting to do. Mr. Purdy explained that if one were facing his home from the Strand, they would see that there were two front entry ways – one being central and one to the left, off of the driveway. The one to the left has a plywood entryway (vestibule) that had been added to the property so that one walks through this section in order to get to an existing door leading into the house. Mr. Purdy went on to say that they wanted to remove the vestibule altogether so that when one looks at the house, one would see two front doors. His desire was to make the house look more pleasing and symmetrical by making the plywood entryway go away. He also noted that the existing door was hollow and that they would like to replace that door with another so that the front door and the side foyer door would be the same and much more in keeping with the history of the home. Mr. Deerin asked if there was a brick walk leading up to the current vestibule and door. Mr. Purdy responded there was and it was uneven and his desire was to tidy that up as well. Mr. Deerin asked if there would be a step. Mr. Purdy stated that there was currently an unattractive cement pad there now that they would try to brick over the cement or make it look more handsome. Mr. Deerin stated that he had asked this question in thinking that the commission may need to include that in their approval. With regards to the request to move an interior wall, Chairman Costigan pointed out that this was not in the HDC's purview. Town Manager Cheryl Lewis spoke stating that she was aware of that portion of the request. Mr. Deerin spoke in stating that with respect to 304 E. Strand, he moved that the HDC approve the removal of the existing vestibule and an aluminum door and also, as part of that application, any necessary repairs to the step and brick walkway leading to it. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved with all in favor.
5. Permit #21-09, Thomas and Anne Demarco, 404 S. Morris St., installation of a 10' x 20' fiberglass swimming pool with 150 sq. ft. of surrounding pavers. Dr. Demarco, along with his pool contractor, were virtually present to discuss the application. Dr. Demarco explained that he and his wife were requesting a 10' x 20' swimming pool to be placed in their backyard. He noted that

currently there are 2 different fence styles located in the back of his property that were already in place when the couple purchased their home, that were erected by their neighbors. Dr. Demarco felt that they may do a 3<sup>rd</sup> different design since they don't own the other 2 fences. Chairman Costigan noted that because the fence would not be visible from the street, the HDC wouldn't be picky as to the couple's choice of fencing. However, Chairman Costigan pointed out that the gates would be visible and that they should match the fence. Dr. Demarco responded that they have one gate already so the new pool fence gate would match what they have. Ms. Litty asked if the pool could be seen from Division Street. Chairman Costigan responded that you could see if you were really looking for it but that it would take some doing and would not be readily visible. Dr. Demarco noted that the pool would not have a sliding board or diving board attached to it. Chairman Costigan asked how the contractor was going to get into the property to do the work due to the nature of the size of the property. Mr. Mick Dunne, from Auscare Pools responded that it would be tough but that it could be done. When asked again about the fencing, Mr. Demarco agreed to use 4' wood picket fencing, with latching gates, to be painted white. Mr. Dunne added that the pool surround would be natural blue stone laid in sand. Chairman Costigan made a motion to approve a 10' x20' fiberglass pool with 150 sq. ft. of pavers plus a wooden picket fence in the areas where there is no fencing to including latching gates. The motion was seconded by Mr. Deerin and unanimously carried with all in favor.

6. Permit #21-10, Thomas Baker, 217 South Street, addition to master bedroom. Mr. Baker was virtually present to discuss his application. He explained to the commission that his plan was to place an addition onto his existing master bedroom that would be attached to his existing porch. Mr. Baker explained that he would be using the same materials as found on the house, that that the windows would match the existing ones found on the house along with the same roof materials. He added that this was just an extension that would be basically invisible. Ms. Litty asked about an existing a/c unit that was shown as being under Mr. Baker's bedroom windows. Mr. Baker stated that it would not be going but would be coming out about 8 to 10 feet behind his existing enclosed porch and that the window visible in the bedroom would probably be removed. Chairman Costigan asked about Mr. Baker's existing bay window in the area in which construction has been proposed and whether or not it would go. Mr. Baker responded by stating that was "a good question" and that he thought it would go. He added that the new addition windows would match the rest of the house but added that there may be a smaller size casement windows. Mr. Deerin asked what would happen with the roof. Mr. Baker responded that it would just extend out from where it is now. A question was as to whether what Mr. Baker was presenting was his final plan. Mr. Baker replied that it was and that the commission had his site plan from his engineering firm along with is overall plan. Questions were raised again as to how the roof would tie into the proposed addition and that the plans that Mr. Baker was presenting looked to be those that may have been related to his prior porch application. The members present all agreed that the plans as presented were confusing and that the measurements shown did not agree with what Mr. Baker was planning on doing. This was further complicated by Mr. Baker stating that he was looking into getting a variance to come out a distance of 10', not 7' as shown on a diagram that he had presented. The overall consensus was that Mr. Baker needed to be more specific in his request and present elevation drawings to the commission taken from the creek side looking at the back of the house, and to show the roof lines. Mr. Deerin added that the plans needed to be ones which actually applied to this

project specifically, while Mrs. Stanley added Mr. Baker needed to make up his mind as to how big of an addition he really wanted before coming back to the commission with his plans. The permit was therefore tabled pending more information from Mr. Baker.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby  
Assistant Clerk