

## OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

### MINUTES

**SEPTEMBER 1, 2022**

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the Chairman, James Deerin, on Thursday, September 1, 2022, at 5 p.m., in the meeting room of the Oxford Community Services Building.

Other commission members in attendance were Jennifer Stanley, Julie Wells, Suzanne Litty, and Patricia Ingram. Also in attendance was Town Planner, Maria Brophy.

The minutes of the August 1, 2022 meeting were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following building permits were reviewed by the commission:

1. Permit #22-70, Caroline Benson, 305 N. Morris Street, construction of an in-ground swimming pool surrounded by a 4' wood fence with natural gray exposure with locking gates. In presenting her application, Mrs. Benson explained that she was looking to install a small pool behind her existing garage that would be 7' x 13' in size, slightly elevated by a stone wall, approximately 3' in height, to be placed around it, along with a 4' wooden fence surrounding the pool area. The overall space of the project will be 30' x 40'. Photos were provided as to what the project would look like. The pool would also have an automatic pool cover that would be beige in color. The overall depth of the pool would be 5'. Travertine decking would be used to surround the pool area. A motion was made by Mrs. Stanley (as verbalized by Chairman Deerin) that with regards to the application for 305 N. Morris Street for a small in-ground pool, surrounded by a travertine deck, as shown on the various photos submitted with the application, as well as the pool equipment area/structure to be located behind the garage and pool house, the permit be approved. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried by all in favor.
2. Permit #22-71, Art and Denise Murr, 202 E. Strand, replacing red vinyl shutters with navy vinyl shutters; replacing wood porch floor with poly decking material. Mrs. Murr reminded the commission members that she and her husband had been before the HDC on August 1, 2022 for a consultation in which they had discussed the items that she was now requesting approval for. She noted that nothing had changed since that meeting and that they have decided to go with replacing their existing front porch floor with composite flooring to be gray in color and paneled, vinyl shutters to be navy blue. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to approve the Murrs application at 202 E. Strand to replace their existing vinyl shutters with new vinyl shutters to be navy blue and replace their existing porch flooring with composite gray decking. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wells and unanimously carried by all in favor. Mrs. Stanley noted that this house is a relatively new one and that different regulations would apply regarding the shutter type.
3. Permit #22-61, Suzanne Beyda, 223 S. Morris Street, completion of installation of 3' hair pin fencing, a distance of 82.19 feet along back of property. Chairman Deerin began the review by stating that he understood Ms. Beyda and her neighbors along the rear of her property, John and Madeleine Yates, at 228 South Street, had come to an agreement regarding Ms. Beyda's fence, as previously discussed at the August 1, 2022 HDC meeting. Mr. Yates responded that he and his

wife had come up with an alternative plan if the commission and Ms. Beyda were agreeable to it. This would involve removing a section of Ms. Beyda's rear yard wire fencing (approximately 25' long) and replacing it with white picket fencing. Chairman Deerin asked Ms. Beyda if she would be agreeable to this request. Ms. Beyda responded stating that she would be fine with that and have no objections, provided the Yates installed the white picket fencing in their own yard, not hers, and that she would like to keep the traditional wire fencing that she already has. Chairman Deerin stated that he did not want to be in position to negotiate that as it sounded as though the Yates wanted Ms. Beyda to remove a section of wire fencing from the south side of her property and replace it with a section of picket fencing with the remaining wire fencing kept in place and running along the remaining length of the rear of her property. He asked if anyone had worked out who would pay for what and how this would be done. Mr. Yates responded he had a quote for the work with Ms. Beyda clearly stating that she did not want to pay for it. Mr. Yates asked if she would allow the section discussed to be replaced. Ms. Beyda responded that Mr. Yates could put it on his own property and that she would not object to that. Mrs. Wells asked if this would result in a gap between the two rear yard property lines. Mr. Yates responded that was correct and that there would be a gap. Chairman Deerin commented that he did not think there would be an issue should Mr. Yates erect a section of fencing, on his own property, to protect his view. The only complicated issue would be how the finished portion of the fencing would be completed, with the finished view either facing the Beyda property (which would be the norm) or the finished view facing in towards the Yates property. Mrs. Stanley mentioned that any new fencing the Yates wanted to install could be flush with the Beyda fencing, if they wanted. Town Planner Maria Brophy confirmed that fencing had no setbacks and could come right up to the property line but that the Yates would, in fact, have to submit a permit application of their own, if they decided that they wanted to install their own fencing. Mrs. Yates noted that Ms. Beyda's wire fencing was installed 2' back from Ms. Beyda's rear property line. Chairman Deerin pointed out that the neighbor's could not build something they wanted on their neighbor's property. Planner Brophy suggested that the Yates have a proper survey done of their own property. Chairman Deerin added that the general concept of what the Yates were proposing would fit within the guidelines, but more details were needed, such as where the proposed wooden fencing would be located. Mrs. Yates stated that she would want the picket fencing to be flush with Ms. Beyda's fence. Planner Brophy pointed out that if the white picket fencing were to be flush against Ms. Beyda's existing wire fencing, it would have to be placed on Ms. Beyda's property and, in turn, Ms. Beyda would have to apply for that fence, as she is the owner of the property, the property in which the Yates were wanting a section of picket fencing to be placed. The permit was tabled pending further information.

4. Permit #22-77, Cutts and Case, Tilghman Street, new replacement roof on "Byeberry" house; cedar shingles to replace asphalt. Victor MacSorely, contractor for Ronnie Cutts, owner of Cutts and Case, was present to discuss the application. Mr. MacSorely explained that Mr. Cutts wanted to re-roof the historical building on his property known as the "Byeberry" house. The house currently has a badly deteriorated asphalt roof. It was believed that originally the house had cedar shake roofing. The plan is to remove the roofing completely and replace it with historically correct cedar shingles. There being no questions raised about the project, a motion was made by Chairman Deerin that with respect to the Cutts and Case property's "Byeberry" house, that the application to remove the existing asphalt roofing on the house and replacement of the asphalt with a cedar wood shingles be approved. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.

5. Permit #22-69, William Britton, 206 Tred Avon Avenue, add awning over upstairs deck; add 4' picket fence behind storage shed to hide trash cans from West Street. Mr. Britton explained to the commission that he was looking to install a retractable awning over his second floor deck, located on the rear of his house. The awning color would be blue and white stripe, similar to one on a house located on the corner of Tred Avon Avenue and West Division Street. He also explained his request for a small section of fencing that he would like to install by his storage shed, located in his backyard, to hide his trash cans which face onto West Street. The fencing itself would simply act as a shield to prevent the view of the trashcans. Ms. Litty made a motion to approve Mr. Britton's proposals for fencing and a blue and white strip awning as shown in his application. The motion was seconded by others and unanimously carried with all in favor.
6. Permit #72, Abigail Smith, 219 South Street, new pool pervious deck installation with hot tub; hot tub to be set on a 100 sq. ft. concrete slab. Ms. Smith was represented by her builder, Bill Booze. Mr. Booze explained that the applicant was looking to replace the existing wood decking around her existing swimming pool with pvc material decking along with installing a new hot tub and changing the fencing around the pool pump. The new fencing would match the brown fencing that currently exists on the property. The hot tub would be placed in an area where the property owner had asked to install new fencing last month. Chairman Deerin asked if the hot tub would be placed on a pad. Mr. Booze responded that it would and that the pad would be flush with the decking. No questions were raised by the commission members. Mr. Deerin made a motion to approve the application of Abigail Smith at 219 South Street to install new pervious decking, a hot tub, a slab for the hot tub, and to replace existing fencing around the pool equipment. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor.
7. Permit #22-59, Gail Steckler, 106 Benoni Street, replace 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows in front of house. Chairman Deerin noted that the applicant was present at the August 1, 2022 meeting at which approval had been given at that time for Ms. Steckler to replace the windows along the west side of her home. However, her request to replace the windows, on the front of her home, on the second floor, were not approved the commission at that time. A discussion had taken place at that time in which it had been noted that her home was on the register as a contributing historic home. It was also explained that contributing houses have to be strictly reviewed by the commission for any change requests. Ms. Steckler responded by stating that she had brought in a sample at this evening's meeting of what she wanted to replace the old, historic front windows with. The new windows would have the same configuration as what is there now with a single muntin in the middle, going down, and would look identical in appearance. The window itself would not be wooden but fiberglass. Mrs. Stanley asked if it would be custom made. Ms. Steckler responded that it would be made to fit the area of the existing window(s). Mrs. Stanley responded that she did not think a fiberglass material was what the HDC was looking for and that she thought the commission would want replacement windows made of wood that would need to replicate what is there now, meaning that the original "wavy" glass in the existing windows would need to be reused. Ms. Steckler noted that she was looking to have a more energy efficient windows. Chairman Deerin added that the commission was not trying to have the same look replicated but rather they were looking to preserve the historic home and all its features. He added that the guidelines go into great details about windows. He explained that the windows that Ms. Steckler was looking to replace were historic and that historic windows should be retained, if at all possible. In visiting the site and looking at the windows in questions, Chairman Deerin felt the

windows could be repaired and restored properly. He added that Ms. Steckler could also look into installing interior storm windows so that they would not been seen from the outside. Following some suggestions by the members for ways to preserve the front windows, a motion was made by Chairman Deerin that the commission **not approve** the replacement of the four (4) second story windows at 106 Benoni Street. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor.

8. Permit #22-68, David and Rose Donovan, 203 N. Morris Street, renovation and addition including new front porch, dormers in the existing roof, addition of master suite on SW side, cathedral ceilings, addition of second floor, and replacement of windows and exterior finishes. Mr. Donovan, along with his residential designer, Timothy Kearns, were present to discuss the application. Mr. Kearns pointed out to the commission members that the plans were the final version of the same plans presented under a consultation to the commission members back at their meeting in April 2022. Mr. Kearns also verified that the exterior had not been changed from what was presented back in April. A comment was made by Mrs. Stanley that she hoped the owners would install cisterns given the type of roof that will be placed on their house. Mrs. Wells made a motion that the permit of David and Rose Donovan, at 203 N. Morris Street, be approved as shown on the final plans dated August 8, 2022. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor.
9. Permit #22-73, Philip Layton and Dana Fitzsimmons, 508 Valliant's Lane, removal of existing lot coverage, construction of dining addition, residing, reroofing, and rescreening. Mr. Layton and Mr. Fitzsimmons were represented by Nicholas Cappella, architect with the firm of Christine Dayton Architect. Mr. Cappella explained that they had previously been before the commission with a much larger project, but that due to construction costs, the work has now been scaled down into a much smaller project. The project will including new roofing, siding, windows, and an addition on the water side toward the neighbor's house at 506 E. Strand, consisting of a small dining room and a small section of new sidewalk. A new section of roof will only occur in the back of the house where the new addition will be located, and consist of a shed roof. New windows will include 1 over 1 and 6 over 6 windows. New roofing will cover the entire house. New siding for the entire house will be Hardie plank with Azek trim. The siding color will be pearl gray. A new door will be installed facing onto Valliant's Lane. The door facing the Strand side will be painted red. New green shutters will be installed, along with the rescreening of the porch and replacement of the home's existing bay window with a flat window. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to approve the building plans for 508 Valliant's Lane, home of Philip Layton and Dana Fitzsimmons, to remove existing lot coverage, construct a dining room addition, along with residing, reroofing, and rescreening an existing porch in accordance with the August 2022 set of plans as provided by the applicant. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.
10. Permit #22-66, William and Irina Cawley, 106 Stewart Avenue, install 4' wooden Oxford style fence across back of property, to be painted white. Mr. Cawley explained that his plans was to run a 4' wooden fence across the back of his property to be painted white. A boundary survey of the property was attached to the application showing where the new fencing would be located. No comments were received from the commission members. Chairman Deerin made a motion that with respect to the application of William and Irina Cawley, at 106 Stewart Avenue, for a 4', white, Oxford style wooden fence, as shown on the plat attached to the application, that the commission approve the permit. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried with all in favor.

11. Permit #22-75, William and Irina Cawley, 106 Stewart Avenue, new home with attached garage. Prior to the discussion of the application, Chairman Deerin noted that the members were reviewing the set of building plans labeled as M22-075 and that the plans would become part of the building permit. It was discussed that the new home would have Hardie Plank siding with Hardy Plank trim and black trimmed windows. Mrs. Wells pointed out that black trimmed windows were something not normally seen within the historic district. Chairman Deerin asked about the color for the house. Mr. Cawley responded that the house would be white with multi shades of gray roofing. The metal roofs on the house would be black, standing seam. Chairman Deerin asked if the house would have any patios. Mr. Cawley replied that they hadn't looked into having any at this time. When asked if the house would need to be elevated, Mr. Cawley noted that the property was out of the flood hazard area. Mr. Cawley also noted that they had found an old, buried sidewalk in front of his property that they would try to salvage but that the plans for the sidewalk, steps, and driveway had not yet been finalized but that he would return to meet with the HDC once he and his wife have come up with a plan. Both Mrs. Wells and Mrs. Stanley voiced their concerns with regards to the windows having black trim. Chairman Deerin spoke stating that though this was a new construction, it should blend in with the streetscape and that the black trim on the windows was rather jarring as opposed to other houses in the historic district. He asked Mr. Cawley if he would consider changing the trim to white. Mr. Cawley responded that he would look around town and compare other windows to his. With the exception of the window trim, Chairman Deerin stated that he liked the design and look of the house and, addressing the members, suggested they approve the plans with the exception of the black window trim and that the applicant look around and come back to the commission with regards to the window trim. Town Planner Maria Brophy asked about the door color. Mr. Cawley responded that the photo shown of the proposed house shows a black door but that they are considering mauve. Chairman Deerin then made a motion that the commission approve the construction of a new home at 106 Stewart Avenue, by William and Irina Cawley, as shown on the set of plans labeled at M22-075, as also shown on a photo provided at the meeting, dated 7/26/22, with the exception of the black trim on the windows and that the applicants look around and revisit that issue with the HDC when they are ready. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wells and unanimously carried with all in favor.
12. Permit #22-65, Timothy Wilson, 214 South Street, enclose existing screened porch. Mr. Wilson explained to the commission that he has a screened-in porch located on the back of his house that he was wanting to make into a 3-season porch by replacing the screens with windows. Chairman Deerin confirmed that the porch was not visible from the street and that it couldn't be seen easily by the neighboring houses. The new windows would be jalousie windows. The large screen-in sections would be divided in half so that the bottom half would have wood paneling and the top half would have the windows. The project would also include an aluminum screen door with storm panels. Ms. Litty made a motion to approve the request for the screened-in porch to be switched to windows. Chairman Deerin changed the motion by stating that he moved that the commission approve the application of Tim Wilson at 214 South Street to enclose his rear screened porch by installing in the lower portion of the porch white, fixed paneling and the larger, screened areas with triple casement, white, exterior frame Anderson windows as shown on the pricing sheet, as attached to the application, and white aluminum screen/storm door to replace the existing screen door. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.
13. Permit # 22-74, Jennifer Stanley, 225 S. Morris Street, reroofing of cedar shingle steeple with cooper. It was noted for the record that Jennifer Stanley had recused herself from the commission in order to present her application. Mrs. Stanley explained that she was looking to replace the

cedar shingles on her church steeple with cooper roofing. The cedar shingles currently on the steeple were placed there in 1991. She noted that that type of shingle was now harder to come by, that they no longer last as long as they did in older days, and that woodpeckers like them. When asked what material was originally placed on the steeple, Mrs. Stanley confirmed that it was cedar shingles. Mrs. Stanley gave a brief history of the church explaining that when it was originally built in 1859, its style was Greek Revival and that it did not have a steeple. The steeple was added to the church around 1882 and looked the way it looks now. The original steeple was struck by lightening and new steeple was added by the Stanleys and rebuilt by local building contractor Joe Balderson. When asked about the cooper roofing, Mrs. Stanley stated that it the look of the cooper wouldn't stay shiny for long and should fade within two months. She added that it would not turn green and just darken, like the copper gutters that were on the church. Planner Brophy spoke stating that cooper usually takes 5 to 7 months to oxidize. Chairman Deerin stated that it would be jarring to see the steeple covered in copper when first seen. He asked about a photo that was provided to the members by Mrs. Stanley which showed a church steeple in Easton that has a copper roof and how old the church was in the photo. Mrs. Stanley responded that she had no idea and that the point of cladding the steeple with copper was to maintain the steeple for as long as possible as copper is supposed to last for 100 years, as opposed to the cedar shingles, which only lasted for 30 years. Chairman Deerin noted that the church was an historic building and a prominent one in town. He voiced his concern over putting back something that was better and more efficient as opposed to putting back what was and has been originally on it. Ms. Litty made a motion that the commission approve replacing the cedar shingles on the steeple with copper and a white surround. Mrs. Wells quoted from the HDC guidelines that "like-kind replacement of deteriorating roofing on historic structures is strongly encouraged." Chairman Deerin stated the commission would, in essence, be overriding that but that the commission did that regularly anyway and cited the example of the Steckler house on Benoni Street in which the commission approved the replacement of the historic windows on the side of the house. Mrs. Stanley admitted that she and her builder struggled with the decision to request copper roofing but that steeples are a huge investment to maintain. Chairman Deerin seconded the motion. A vote was taken and approved by a vote of 3 to 1 as follows: Suzanne Litty – approved, James Deerin – approved, Patricia Ingram – approved, Julie Wells – disapproved, Jennifer Stanley – recused.

This concluded the review of permit application.

Prior to adjourning Chairman Deerin stated that the commission did not need these long agenda and long meeting hours and that the office stated they would work on that. Planner Brophy spoke stating that she had made a schedule and posted it on the town website that would limit the number of application to 8 with only 6 significant application allowed, though it may vary if there are a larger number of small applications. It was noted that this meeting was different in that it had to be moved from September 12<sup>th</sup> to September 1<sup>st</sup> (due to scheduling problems) but that the cut-off date of August 29<sup>th</sup> still applied.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby

Assistant Clerk