

OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

APRIL 5, 2021

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Thomas Costigan, on Monday, April 5, 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 Jennifer Stanley, Patricia Ingram, James Deering, and Julie Wells. Also present was Town Manager Cheryl Lewis.

The minutes of March 1, 2021 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following building permits were reviewed by the commission:

1. Permit #21-25, Megan Beyer, 105 N. Morris Street, flagstone patio facing waterside, behind guesthouse. Mrs. Beyer, who was virtually present, explained that she was looking to install a rectangular flagstone patio, bordered in brick, behind her guesthouse/garage. Chairman Costigan pointed out that this request really did fall into the category of ‘it can’t be seen from the street.’ Mr. Deerin asked if a piece of the flagstone would wrap around in front of the guesthouse door, and if so, that it wouldn’t make any difference to him, as it would just be a small piece from the door to the patio in order to tie it altogether. Chairman Costigan agreed that it made sense and that the owner could do so if she so desired. Mrs. Stanley asked about the property line. Mrs. Beyer clarified that the patio would not cross over into the neighboring property at 201 N. Morris Street, and that she had spoken with her neighbor at that address who voiced his approval to her of the proposed project. Mrs. Stanley made a motion that the commission accept the drawing for a flagstone patio to be installed at 105 N. Morris Street behind the garage structure. Mr. Deerin amended the motion and seconded the motion to include that the flagstone would be bordered with brick and that it could also include the option of a small piece going to the door. The motion was unanimously approved with all in favor.
2. Permit #21-26, Mary Jordan and Curt Reintsma, 210 S. Morris St., picket fencing between owner’s driveway and neighbor’s side yard. Ms. Jordan, who was virtually present along with her husband, Curt Reintsma, explained that along her driveway, on the side of her neighbor at 208 S. Morris Street, there are a series of diseased boxwoods that hide her neighbor’s a/c units. The plan is to remove the boxwoods and replace them with a section of 4’ fencing to hide the neighbor’s equipment. In front of the section in which the 4’ fencing would be erected, and located on that same side, is an ash tree. The 4’ fencing would go up to the ash tree, then stop, and begin again on the other side of the tree but would drop down in height to 25”-26” in order to match the neighbor’s fencing. She added that the property lines on the property were well marked and that the new fencing would be coming in 12” into her yard from the property line. Chairman Costigan

stated that the commission would appreciate a better plat showing the property with a line drawn on it to show where the fencing was going. Mrs. Wells asked if the different heights could be seen from the road. Ms. Jordan responded that it could, but that even though the height of the fencing on that side would be different, the ash tree in the center of that property line would help in breaking up the view of the fencing. Ms. Jordan also noted that the 25” inch fencing in the front, which would match the neighbor’s fencing, would not cut it in hiding her neighbor’s equipment in the back and that she thought this was the best solution for this particular area. Chairman Costigan agreed that the location of the ash tree helped with the transition of fencing heights. When asked what the fencing would look like, Ms. Jordan responded that it would be in the style of the Oxford fencing but without the hole at the top. She also noted that landscaping would be done along the fencing to make it less noticeable. Mr. Deerin made a motion to approve the application to remove the boxwood and install 32’ of picket fencing as described in the application. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously approved without further discussion.

3. Permit #21-27, Bruce Purdy and Barrett Shepard, 304 E. Strand, replacement of 8 Anderson windows with 8 new Anderson windows – replacing existing windows with same double hung windows. Mr. Purdy, who was virtually present, explained that the request was to just replacing the existing 8 windows in the front of his house with the same, exact Anderson windows that would just be newer, better, and more energy efficient. The windows would be double hung, just as they are now, look exactly the same, and that they would be true replacement windows. Mrs. Wells made a motion that the commission approve the window replacement at 304 E. Strand for 8 new Anderson replacement windows, double hung, in the front of the house. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor.
4. Permit #21-28, Hasan and Deborah Dogrul, 302 E. Strand, alteration of existing covered porch on front of house by adding screens in between existing posts to turn structure into a screen porch. The Dogruls were virtually represented by their contractor, Chuck Callahan. Mr. Callahan explained that basically the couple wanted to rescreen their front porch and build and install a new screen door. The only thing they would possibly want that would be different was an “ultraview screen” that Mr. Callahan stated had more of a clear look than a dark screen look. Chairman Costigan responded that a less obvious screen sounded like a great option. Mr. Deerin asked if the new door would be just a screen door or a storm door. Mr. Callahan responded it would just be a screen door. Chairman Costigan pointed out that nothing structurally was taking place on the house. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to accept the application for the Dogruls at 302 E. Strand to take a covered porch and add screens and make a screen door to fit the structure. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.
5. Addendum to Permit #21-19, Oxford Museum, 101 S. Morris St., erect semi-permanent exhibit structure on south side with four (4) 73” high by 55” wide removable exhibit screen mounted in sleeves in ground. Mrs. Wells, President of the Oxford Museum, recused herself from the meeting in order to represent the museum. She explained that since last meeting with the commission the museum had come up with different verbiage for the structure they wished to erect on the south side of the museum’s backyard. In discussing the project with Town Manager Cheryl Lewis, they decided that the structure should be called a semi-permanent exhibit structure. The structure will be removable and

could be taken down and stored in the winter. It would have different panels for different times and exhibits and would be flexible for change. Chairman Costigan asked about the existing air conditioner and if it was going to be relocated. Mrs. Wells responded that the museum would be keeping it in the same location but would be installing picket fencing around it in order to hide it. Chairman Costigan then asked about the placement of the new semi-permanent exhibit structure. Mrs. Wells responded that it would be installed to be in line with the foundation of the museum's shed and not right on the property line. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to approve the proposed exhibit structure for the museum as illustrated in the packet and described by Mrs. Wells. Mrs. Wells spoke stating that she would like to make a correction with regards to the length of the proposed new fencing for the museum. The new fencing will only pick up from where the existing fencing is facing on to Market Street and stop at the Pork Alley, consisting of only 66' in length. Chairman Costigan added to Mrs. Stanley's motion the modification of the length of the fence as approved at the HDC's March 2021 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Deerin and unanimously carried.

This concluded the review of building permits.

CONSULTATIONS

A virtual consultation was held with Mr. and Mrs. Jay Martin, property owners of 204 Factory Street. Mr. Martin explained that they were working on putting together a kitchen renovation project. The area in which the kitchen is located has a hip roof, thus compromising the height of the kitchen at 6'4". The proposed plans would call for the raising of the existing roof by changing the pitch of that roof, and removing a bay window and single window which would be replaced with French sliders leading out to a new 12'x 24' deck. Chairman Costigan asked about the 3 existing dormers on the house and what would be under them. Mr. Martin responded that currently there exists an asphalt roof but that would be changed with the new pitch and the asphalt replaced with a metal roof. Chairman Costigan pointed out that for presentation purposes the commission generally likes to see a drawing of what is there now along with the new drawing in order to go back and forth between the two. He suggested that Mr. Martin could supply photos of what is there now as another option. Chairman Costigan asked about a change he noticed to the front of the property regarding the entry. Mr. Martin responded that they were looking to add on a portico to the front door location along with possible residing the house. Currently the house is covered in vinyl and Mr. Martin stated that they were looking into replacing the vinyl with a synthetic shaker style siding along with changing the color of the house. Chairman Costigan also asked about a possible new staircase leading to the ground level. Mr. Martin responded that the preliminary plan did show two separate entry locations onto the deck but he thought they might be changing that to just one. Mr. Deerin stated that he liked the portico idea, that the residing of the house made sense and the change to the rear of the house by raising the current roofline, along with installing sliding glass doors leading onto a new deck but that he would like to see the current condition of the house along with the proposed plans. Chairman Costigan suggested Mr. Martin take that advice as that would give the group a good idea of the transition and that even though the Martin house was not historic, the commission would still want to make sure it will continue to fit in within the historic district. He closed by stating that since no one really had a problem with what the couple wanted, they could submit their building permit application and just attach to it the extra information that was suggested. Mr. Deerin added that they would need to include other specifications such as paint color,

materials, etc.

A second virtual consultation was held with Catherine Bitter, interior designer and representative for Jennifer Coyle, property owner at 108 E. Strand. Ms. Bitter discussed with the members the possibility of using minimal cable railings along the side and rear of Ms. Coyle's recently installed new deck which abuts a series of shrubs and would be difficult to maintain. She noted that they would not be seen easily from the public view and that they would be more aesthetically pleasing to look at rather than PVC railing. Mrs. Wells pointed out that the cabling railings would be seen from The Strand and that she felt the wire was too modern for such an historic area. Ms. Bitter responded that given the size of the property and because of the number of plantings that had to be placed in the area around the deck to meet the critical area criteria, wood railing would be hard to maintain. Chairman Costigan asked what material would be used for the top rail. Ms. Bitter responded that it could be PVC or Azek or wood, if necessary. Chairman Costigan pointed out that though the house itself was not historic, it still should fit in with the neighboring houses though he did understand the maintenance issue and that this house was located in a high maintenance area. He suggested that Ms. Bitter come up with another option. Ms. Bitter responded their alternative would be an Azek product and asked if she could send the commission images they would consider using. Chairman Costigan agreed that would be acceptable.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby

Assistant Clerk