

## OXFORD PLANNING COMMISSION

### MINUTES

FEBRUARY 2, 2021

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Planning Commission was called to order by the Chairman, David Baker, on Tuesday, October 6, 2020, at 6:00 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 Reed, Edwin Miller, and Steve Mroczek. Also in attendance was Town Manager Cheryl Lewis.

The minutes of the meetings of September 1, 2020 and October 6, 2020 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following building permit was reviewed by the commission:

- Permit #21-10, Thomas Baker, 217 South Street, addition to master bedroom. Mr. Baker was virtually present to discuss the application. Mr. Baker began his discussion by informing the planning members that he had met with the Historic District Commission who had asked him for a better set of drawings which, he noted, he was in the process of having done. In the meantime, he stated that he was hoping the Planning Commission could provide him with some clarification with regards to his rear yard setbacks, particularly in the area in which he was hoping to build the addition to his bedroom. Mr. Baker noted that this particular area was complicated in that he was dealing with a triangular area and that there was some ambiguity with regards to the setback line being drawn from a bulkhead, which had since been replaced and moved further out into the water. Prior to the discussion of the setbacks, Chairman Baker questioned some calculations shown on the plat that Mr. Baker had provided which gave a breakdown of the existing impervious surface coverage on the lot. Mr. Baker admitted that he should have reviewed the plat more carefully when it was drawn up for him because some of the information on it was incorrect, particularly that which dealt his deck. He explained that a deck he once had had recently been removed and replaced with a new, smaller one (16' x 18') in order to allow him to build an enclosed porch. The new deck was built with ¼" spacing between the boards with no gravel under it thus being considered as pervious instead of impervious as shown on his plat's calculations. As a result, the figures should be changed so that the total imperious surface coverage would come in at 39.6%, which would include the newly requested addition to the bedroom. Chairman Baker reminded Mr. Baker that in building an addition he would have to work within the building setback lines and if he wanted to go beyond the setbacks, the Planning Commission would not be able to approve the permit. However, he noted that Mr. Baker could seek approval through the Board of Appeals, if he desired to do so. Mr. Baker responded by asking if it would be feasible to bring his requested addition back 1' further and that he was looking for a compromise. Chairman Baker spoke stating that this was an unusual lot because of the triangular bulkhead which affected the rear yard setback but nonetheless, the commission was guided by the Critical Area Commission and the 25' setback rule was one they could not ignore. He again stated that Mr. Baker could either work within his setbacks or pursue a variance. Mr. Baker explained that recently the bulkhead had been rebuilt causing it to project out further into the water. He felt that this change would affect this distance from his house to the water thus affecting the building restriction lines. Mr. Mroczek pointed out that if the bulkhead was moved then the plat

drawing for the Baker property may not be correct and suggested that Mr. Baker have it resurveyed. Mr. Baker agreed that was true and the suggestion made sense.

Mr. Miller agreed with Mr. Mroczek and asked Mr. Baker to consider Mr. Mroczek's suggestion to have the property resurveyed and added what Chairman Baker had already stated that the commission could not negotiate with the Critical Area Commission. Mr. Baker ended the discussion by stating he would either reduce the size of his addition, work with the diagonal line created by the setback, or resurvey the property. Mr. Miller ended the discussion by stating that if Mr. Baker were to resurvey the property, it would settle the problem. The permit was tabled pending further information.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby  
Assistant Clerk