

OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 13, 2021

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Thomas Costigan, on Monday, September 13, 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 virtually present was Town Manager Cheryl Lewis and Town Planner Maria Brophy.

The minutes of August 2, 2021 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following building permits were reviewed by the commission:

- Revision to permit #21-59, Ennismore, LLC, 105 S. Morris Street, revision request to remove 2 existing brick chimneys, patch sheathing and install new roof over openings. Architect Cameron MacTavish was virtually present to discuss the application. Mr. MacTavish noted that The Mews building project was now under construction and it was discovered that the approved plans did not include the demolition of two existing brick chimneys on the building, both of which were found to be in bad shape. The chimneys would be demolished all the way down to the foundation and the roof patched after their removal. Chairman Costigan spoke stating that neither chimney was clearly visible. Mr. Deerin made a motion that the commission approve the application of 105 S. Morris Street for the removal of the two chimneys, to patch the openings, and install new matching shingles. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.
- Permit #21-86, Mark Lacey and John Pittman, 207 S. Morris Street, replace roofing on house. Mr. Lacey, who was virtually present, explained that he and Mr. Pittman had recently purchased this house and that the roofing material was in bad shape on both the main part of the house and front porch. The plan is to install a black, raised, seam metal roof on the porch, consistent with the materials on the house. Mr. Lacey stated that originally, they had looked at replacing the main part of the house with cedar but now feel asphalt would be the best material, not only for affordability but also for availability. The shingles would be dark gray in color. The rubber membrane on the back of the house would remain. Chairman Costigan pointed out that the application had attached to it a sample of various asphalt shingles. Mr. Lacey stated that there were problems with availability and that there were 3 shades of gray he liked. The choice would depend on which one would be available. Chairman Costigan asked that when the decision was made, that Mr. Lacey contact the town office and let them know. Ms. Litty made a motion to approve the two color roofs that the owners had chosen. The motion was seconded by Mr. Deerin and unanimously carried with all in favor.
- Permit #21-85, MKW, LLC, 209 South Street, reside existing shed in backyard. Local residential designer Timothy Kearns was virtually present to discuss the application. He explained that cement board and batten would be used on the exterior of the shed and that the paint color would match that of the house. New roofing materials would be placed on the shed to match the roof materials on the house. Mrs. Stanley asked if the shed was old. Mr. Kearns responded it was not. Mrs. Stanley then made a motion that the commission accept the proposal to change the

shed siding to board and batten along with a new roof to match the house roof and color to match the house as well. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

- Permit #21-89, James and Stacey Bredar, 224 South St., install white vinyl clad railing on front porch and at steps, new window boxes, and address plaque in front of house. Both Mr. and Mrs. Bredar were virtually present to discuss the application. Mr. Bredar explained their previously approved shutters and downspouts would be going on the house in the coming week and that their new project was to install railing on the front porch and stoops with white vinyl sleeves and spindles consistent with the photos shown in their application, along with white window boxes under two of the three windows in the front, and to attach a plaque with the house numbers to the front door. Mrs. Bredar added that the existing black railing in front of their house had given way and that they needed the railing up as soon as possible. Mr. Deerin made a motion with respect to the application referring to permit #21-89, for the installation of vinyl clad railing on the front porch and at the steps, new window boxes, and address plaque, be approved. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor.
- Revision to permit #21-66, David Poe, 301 N. Morris St., revision to existing permit to omit elevator request. Timothy Kearns presented the application which was a revision to a previously approved permit for the couple to install a solarium and exterior elevator. The plan is to now eliminate the exterior elevator and, in its place, install windows on the first floor to match those windows already on the house. A much simpler elevator, that is self-contained, had been found which could be mounted within the house. Everything else on the original plan would stay the same. Ms. Litty made a motion that the commission approve an interior elevator at 301 N. Morris Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Deerin and unanimously carried with all in favor.
- Permit #21-88, Daniel and Susan Kordell, 510 E. Strand, replace existing driveway and front walk with dry laid clay brick pavers. The couple were virtually present to discuss the application. Mr. Kordell spoke stating that this was a resubmission of an application that had been approved but had expired. He explained that they wished to remove an existing brick walkway leading to their and replace with it with dry laid bricks along with removing their existing gravel driveway and replacing that as well with dry laid bricks so that both items would all match. No increase in coverage would occur. Mr. Deerin made a motion to approve the replacement of the driveway and front walk with dry laid brick as shown on the application. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.
- Permit #21-90, Harriet Foster, 220 S. Morris Street, new gutters on home and replacement of front yard fencing. Mrs. Foster, who was virtually presented, explained that she was requesting approval of gutters to be placed in front of her outside doors to run the length of the porches. The gutters would be white, 6", ½ wide gutters. She noted that she also wanted to replace the fencing in her front yard in the same location, using the same materials so that it would remain looking the same as it currently does. Chairman Costigan stated that he was glad Mrs. Foster wanted to replace the fence exactly as it is because it was a very pretty style. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to approve the application at 220 S. Morris Street for ½ round gutters in front of the 5 doorways of the house and replacement of the front yard fencing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Deerin and unanimously approved with all in favor.
- Permit #21-82, Linda Taffe, 307 S. Morris Street, alteration of 3 windows down to 1 along with request to replace a door with a window. Ms. Taffe's partner, Dan Carey, was virtually present to discuss the application. Mr. Carey explained that the south side of the house currently has 3 windows that they want to replace with 1 window that will match the others on the house. New siding will be added to that side that will match the original siding along with shutters being placed along side the new window that will match the other existing shutters on the house. He added

that on the back of the house there exists a door that they want to remove and replace with a window that also would match the others on the house. Mr. Deerin stated he wanted to make sure the shutters would be in proportion to the windows being installed. Mrs. Wells asked if the new window on the south side would be centered. Mr. Carey responded to the members that the shutters would be in proportion to the window and the new window would be centered. Chairman Costigan made a motion to approve the change to the exterior at 307 S. Morris Street by taking out 3 modern windows, replacing them with a single casement with shutters and removing a door and replacing it with a casement as shown and presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Deerin and unanimously carried with all in favor.

- Permit #21-87, Jennifer Coyle, 108 Strand, replace and reconfigure existing porch posts with white, structural fiberglass posts and expand rear steps to open decks with railing; add Intex pergola system. Ms. Coyle was represented by Tim Kearns. Chairman Costigan noted that the application was confusing as he thought the commission had already approved the description of the proposed project other than the pergola. Mr. Kearns responded that was correct but that the pergola tied into the railing system that the commission approved and was replacing what was to be a retractable awning. Mr. Kearns further explained that the photos in the permit packet showed what was currently existing (just the decking without the railing in place), what was approved (the decking and railing with an awning), and finally the proposed pergola in place of the awning on the back deck. He added that the owner is using an Intex system for the deck railing that describes a very typical picket with a bottom and top rail. In a past meeting with the HDC, the owner had wanted a wire system which the commission nixed and asked to see a drawing with a good railing. Mr. Kearns referred the commission to page A4 of the drawings which showed a revised railing that makes up the post of the pergola. Steps in the back of the deck would be centered in front of the pergola. The back of the house contains 2 back doors and the pergola would come over top of both. Mr. Kearns added that the pergola would be made from white Azek. Mr. Deerin made a motion with respect to 108 E. Strand, to replace and reconfigure the existing porch posts with pairs of 6x6 structural fiberglass posts painted white, expand the rear steps to open decks with code compliant railing system, omit previously approved retractable awning on rear façade, and replace with an Intex pergola system be approved. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor.
- Permit #21-80, Freiderikos Franke, 208 Factory Street, remove existing roof surface, install new underlayment, and add solar shingles. Mr. Franke was virtually present to discuss the application. Chairman Costigan stated he had seen where some of the equipment had been located and some had been moved inside Mr. Franke's garage. Mr. Franke responded that this was correct and that the batteries were in the garage and that the electrical panels would be moved to the outside, back behind the house where it could not be seen from the street. Chairman Costigan asked if the electrical panel would be located near his electrical meter. Mr. Franke responded this was correct and that the equipment would be in closed metal boxes. Chairman Costigan noted that his concern was the extent of the roof tiles and asked Mr. Franke if he was planning on tiling the entire roof of his house. Mr. Franke stated that this was correct along with the accessory structure. Mr. Deerin spoke stating this his concern with the Tesla shingles was that they would be shiny and would not have a dull finish. He asked Mr. Franke if he had ever actually seen them. Mr. Franke responded he had not. Architect Christine Dayton, who was also virtually present at the meeting, spoke stating that the shingles were not shiny and that on the web they are seen as glass but a matte-colored glass. Chairman Costigan noted that the commission was dealing with something that was new and never been presented until recently. Though the commission had seen some brochures with regards to the tiles, the marketing material they had was from long

ago and possibly out-of-date. Mr. Deerin stated that when one sees photos of the solar black slate like tile materials, one sees doors and windows reflected in the tile. He added that he just wanted to see a sample tile. Ms. Dayton responded that she could play a short video for the group which the Tesla company made showing that the tiles resemble slate. The commission agreed and viewed the video that Ms. Dayton had found. Chairman Costigan stated that the video was helpful and made a motion to approve the removal of the existing roof surface, install new underlayment, and add solar roof tiles and peripherals to the rear of the property. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty. Chairman Costigan asked that a vote be taken. The results were as follows: Suzanne Litty – yea; Patrician Ingram – yea; James Deerin – yea; Jennifer Stanley – yea; Thomas Costigan – yea. The vote was unanimous in the approval of the application. Chairman Costigan reminded Mr. Franke he had 6 months to start the project and one year to finish. He added that he hoped this permit would act as a test case for the commission.

- Permit #19-50A, Analipsi, LLC, 200 West, revision to existing permit reflecting change in number of energy storage systems and relocation of exterior equipment; approval of foundations for garden structures; approval of front door color of house and accessory structure. Both Thomas Caravytha and his architect, Christine Dayton, were present to discuss the application. The discussion began with the request for the placement of the electrical equipment on the guesthouse. Ms. Dayton explained that some of the boxes that Mr. Caravytha wanted in the back of his house were being proposed to go on the accessory building at 200 West Street. The first option would be to screen the electrical equipment with plantings as shown in the application drawing labeled as “P1”. The second option would be to enclose it. Chairman Costigan pointed out that what made this application a bit trickier than Mr. Franke’s permit at 208 Factory Street was that in Mr. Franke’s situation, the electrical work was being located pretty much out of sight. In this case, it was fairly visible. Ms. Dayton acknowledged this was correct but stated that another thing the owner could do, in addition to putting in plantings, would be to paint out the panels. In addition to what was being discussed, Ms. Dayton began talking about the approval the HDC had given to put lattice on the side of the accessory structure over Delmarva Power’s electrical equipment and Mr. Caravytha’s desire to now use shingles over a carriage like door, instead of the lattice, whereby everything would be painted out on the sides. Chairman Costigan asked the commission members for their comments on the two options presented. It was agreed by all the members that the lattice was the superior choice instead of using plantings as shown on “P1” as plants can die. Chairman Costigan made a motion to approve the enclosure for the Tesla peripherals as shown on the architectural drawing “P2” showing the Tesla peripherals on the guesthouse. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor. Discussion next took place on the request for a series of platforms to hold garden structures. Mrs. Dayton explained that there are bases in front of the house that the owner understands need to be approved and that they are platforms/pedestals for garden pots. These consist of 6 concrete bases, 2’ x 2’ x 16” tall. Chairman Costigan noted that when the fence on property is installed, one wouldn’t really see the pedestals, just the pots. Mr. Deerin made a motion, with respect to 200 West Street, to approve the installation of 6 basically square pedestals for holding plant urns. Prior to a second on the motion, neighbor Maria Antokas, virtually present, asked how tall the flowerpots would be. Ms. Dayton responded that they would just make it to the top of the fence. Mrs. Wells asked if there was a picture of the pots. Chairman Costigan reminded the members that they don’t review garden pots, just what is attached to the ground. Mrs. Stanley seconded the motion which was then unanimously carried without any further discussion. The third, and final item for discussion was a request to paint the main front door of the house and guesthouse. A color swatch from Benjamin Moore was presented showing

the color “candy cane red”. A question was raised if this color would be used on the two side doors on the guesthouse. The response was that those two doors would be the color of the body of the guesthouse and that just the 2 entry doors would be using this color. Mr. Deerin made a motion, with respect to the request to the painting of the main entrance door to the house and accessory building to be painted Benjamin Moore Candy Cane Red be approved. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor. Chairman Costigan stated that there was another item on the application about approving 4 to 5 trees in the public way. Chairman Costigan reminded the applicant that the HDC does not handle trees or anything dealing with the town’s public ways. Ms. Dayton asked that if Mr. Caravytha wanted to change the approval of the lattice door on the Delmarva side of his accessory building to resemble shingle garage doors, could he do that during this meeting. Chairman Costigan responded, “No,” but that he did think it would make more sense to have the two sides of the building match.

- Permit #21-84, Bartley Eckhardt and Bonnie Johnson, 102 E. Strand, complete renovation of, and addition to, circa 1930 cottage, including stormwater management, concrete and brick terrace, concrete and brick wheel strip driveway, new electric, water, and sewer. Both Mr. Eckhardt and Ms. Johnson were virtually present at the meeting. Mr. Eckhardt explained that their objective with the property remained the same as when they last met with the HDC in consultation. He added that the house, as it is today, is in poor shape and that they wanted to bring it back to its 1930’s original look. This would involve telescoping in the back, raising the ridge of the main structure by 3’ with shed dormers to the north, rebuilding the front porch and extending the front façade of the front porch 18” closer to the street. Mr. Eckhardt mentioned that he had been before the Planning Commission and both the proposed height of the structure, and the setbacks were found to be within the requirements of that section of the historic district. The current front porch extends into the 100’ buffer and an 18” increase would still reside within the buffer. The stormwater plan is under review by the town engineer and the couple’s civil engineer. Architectural drawings and survey were presented to the HDC members. Mr. Eckhardt noted they were just under the 40% maximum impervious surface coverage requirement. Other details presented included walkways, an interrupted median strip driveway, and concrete terrace, all to have a vintage brick edging. The house would have wood siding all the way around with slate gray shingles. No shutters would be used on the house. The windows would be 3 over 1 in the front of the house and 6 over 6 in the back to allow for more light and a better view of the garden. Mr. Eckhardt noted that the house would have a simple 2 color scheme consisting of Benjamin Moore “White Dove” on the house and upper gable section with Benjamin Moore “Woodland Blue” for the trim. Chairman Costigan asked if there was a side porch on the east elevation having a unique bullseye. Mr. Eckhardt responded that was correct and that the bullseye was like a 1930’s art deco trellis. He added that it was an open porch that would contain a pair of French doors leading into the living room. The porch would have a brick floor and step down to a single level patio. Mr. Deerin asked about a second story balcony. Mr. Eckhardt responded it was a narrow walkout with a door leading out to it from the east bedroom. When asked about the shingles for the house, Mr. Eckhardt stated that they would be reinforced fiberglass shingles. Chairman Costigan stated he was thankful the couple met with them in consultation prior to submitted their application as it helped to make sense of the permit. Mr. Deerin made a motion with respect of the application for the renovation of 102 The Strand, that the commission approve the renovation as described in the set of plans in connection with the application prepared by Pamela Gardner dated 7/30/21. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried with all in favor.
- Permit #21-91, William Cawley, 101 Tilghman Street, new home with detached garage. Mr. Cawley, who was virtually present, described his request to build a new home having pewter gray,

architectural asphalt shingles, standing seam metal roofing over the front and side porches, Anderson 400 series 2 over 2 windows, Hardie cement siding, white in color, Azek trim on the fascia, porch, and skirt around the bottom of the steps with a detached garage having the same type of siding and trim. Chairman Costigan noted that the commission did not have the garage plans. Town Planner, Maria Brophy, spoke stating that the office had received the garage plans but that they were received too late to be included in this night's meeting. Mr. Deerin asked if there was a site plan showing the house and garage. Mr. Cawley responded that there was. Focus was shifted back to the review of the house. Chairman Costigan pointed out that though it was not shown anywhere, he was guessing the house would be oriented towards Tilghman Street. Mr. Cawley responded this was correct and that the front door and porch would both be facing Tilghman Street. Mr. Deerin noted that the plans they were reviewing were a stock set that the applicant had made changes to involving two over two windows and Hardie plank siding. Mr. Cawley replied that was correct and that the only things different were the windows and the addition of side porch, which had already been modified in the plans. He added that the house would be built as shown on the plans and that the only other change was the foundation height because part of the property was in the flood zone. Chairman Costigan pointed out that the plans showed 3 steps leading up to the house but thought it would probably be more. Mr. Cawley agreed adding that it would probably be more like 6 or 7. Mr. Cawley also noted that the add-on porch would have cedar posts and that the foundation would be parged. Mrs. Stanley asked if there was a drawing of how the house would sit on the lot. Chairman Costigan responded that the plans didn't really show how the house would sit in relationship to its neighbor. Mr. Cawley spoke stating that on his lot it is higher on the left so the house would come over as far as it could to the left and that he had considered the house behind him and that the garage would be towards the right. Town Manager Cheryl Lewis spoke stating that when the HDC approved the house, directly behind this lot, they were made aware that there was going to be a need for consideration to be given to the height. She added that there was talk back then at that time that when a house was to be built on this lot (Mr. Cawley's lot) that it would be helpful to move it towards the left because the concern at that time was what one would see when they walked down the road. She also noted that Mr. Cawley's first floor would be wherever his neighbor's floor behind him was, so to the eye it would be on the same plateau. Mr. Deerin noted that the changes in the plan would need to be reflected in the approval. Chairman Costigan agreed and that those changes are specifically the windows. Mr. Deerin made a motion that the commission approve the plan for the house, on what is called "Down Home Plans" consisting of 4 sheets and subject to the commission's understanding that the windows will be 2 over 2 Andersons as shown on the sheets attached to the application. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.

This concluded the review of building permits.

CONSULTATION

A consultation was virtually held with architect Christine Dayton who was representing Swallows, LLC, who recently purchase 200 Tred Avon Avenue. Ms. Dayton presented the existing conditions of the property showing a simple house consisting of an original section and a later addition. The plan is to restore a porch that was once there and shown in an historic photo located in the book "Oxford Then and Now". Talk consisted of extended an existing cornice on the house, extending a bay window in the back to the second floor, and removing the addition where the kitchen was. Chairman Costigan felt the commission would look favorably on the changes discussed. There were, however, some

questions as to extension of the cornice found at the top of the house as to whether or not it should continue all the way around the house or not. Town Planner Maria Brophy spoke stating that the request for the addition of a front porch may have to go to the Oxford Planning Commission for approval as its setbacks would be non-conforming. Town Manager Lewis added that it depended on the rest of the street and if the proposed porch would line up with the other existing buildings and structures so as to create a clearly defined setback line. If so, it could be approved without a variance but if not, it would require one. Ms. Brophy added that a proposed site plan would also be needed. Mrs. Wells spoke state that this was a very significant house in Oxford. She thought the plans for the front of the house were great and the removal of the kitchen addition a good idea but did not like the idea of the doble bays in the back of the house. She added that she may be able to find old photos of the home and that the integrity of the house needed to be preserved. Mr. Deerin stated he liked what he saw and was not troubled by the double stacked windows in the back. Town Manager Lewis asked Ms. Dayton to go ahead and get a permit ready now in time for review by the Planning Commission for their upcoming meeting. Ms. Dayton asked for an opinion on what to do with the cornice. Chairman Costigan stated that as far as the frieze is concerned, he felt less is more from what he was hearing in the meeting and liked the idea of having it on the Tred Avon side of the property but that there were conflicting views with it wrapping all the way around. Ms. Dayton also pointed out that on the addition side of the house, a proposal had been made to change two (2) 6 over 6 short, squat, and fat little windows to a 2 over 2 window that would be like the window found on the north side of the building, along the street. Mr. Deerin stated that he thought that made sense and was not offended by any of the suggestions made with regards to the back. Mrs. Stanley also stated that she did not have an opinion one way or the other but thought there might have been a screened porch in the back in the past. The discussion ended with Chairman Costigan stating that there may be the need to do some more historic research.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby

Assistant Clerk