

## OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

### MINUTES

April 3, 2023

The regular monthly meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the Chairman, James Deerin, on Monday, April 3, 2023, at 5:00 p.m., in the meeting room of the Oxford Community Services Building.

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

The minutes of the meeting of March 6, 2023 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following building permits were reviewed by the commission:

1. Permit #22-12, Analipsi, LLC, 200 West Street, amended application for solar shingles. Property owner Thomas Caravythà was present to discuss the application. He noted that the commission had previously approved his permit application to have solar shingles installed on his house but that the solar shingles previously shown on his front porch as “dummy” shingles would now actually be installed with active shingles. Mr. Caravythà added that the appearance of the shingles would remain the same and provided photos for reference. Planner Brophy pointed out that on the original permit it had not been specified that solar shingles would also be used on the porch roof. Mr. Caravythà responded by stating that in the photos submitted with the original approved application, it had shown solar shingles on the porch. No questions were raised by the members. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to approve the amended proposal for solar shingles on the house, per the set of drawings dated 11/30/22, proposed by 200 West Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried with all in favor.
2. Permit #23-25, Michael Gibson, 318 Tilghman Street, 100’ of 4’ tall Oxford style picket fencing and driveway gate. Mr. Gibson’s agent, Bill Booz, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Booz explained that the proposed fencing would meet up with the existing fence already on the property and would include a new 4’ high gate which would go across the driveway. Chairman Deerin pointed out that the existing fencing was “pointed”. Mr. Booz verified that this was correct, and that the existing fencing would remain and transition into the Oxford style fencing, including the gates. Chairman Deerin stated that the only troublesome factor of the permit, for him, was that applicant was not keeping the same design around the entire property. Mr. Booz noted that the existing fencing was not in good shape and would probably be replaced later. Chairman Deerin again stated that he was concerned with the change in the style of the proposed fencing not matching up to the old and thought the owner should put in new fencing all the way around or have the new fencing match the existing fencing. Mr. Booz agreed. Chairman Deerin made a motion that with respect to 318 Tilghman Street, the applicant, through the agent, has agreed rather than retaining the existing picket fencing, would be replacing it with Oxford style picket fencing and the new fencing would be installed as shown on the attachments to the application including a two-part gate at the driveway location. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.

3. Permit #23-26, Kent and Elizabeth Habecker, 503 E. Strand, replacement of existing picket fencing in front yard and two side gates. Mrs. Habecker presented the application by explaining that the property has an existing fence that she and her husband want to replace, with the same height of fencing and in the same area, but with a different style, which would be Oxford style fencing. The two gates in the back from the road will also be redone, using the Oxford style fencing. Everything, including the gates, will remain in the same position. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to accept the permit for 503 E. Strand to replace the existing fencing with Oxford style fencing, including the front and side gates, as shown in the picture which will be included with the application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried with all in favor.
4. Permit #23-24, Ray and Mary Ann Nissen, 224 S. Morris Street, replacement and improvement of existing hardscaping and double track parking pad. Chairman Deerin asked if the parking area was new. Mr. Nissen responded that it wasn't, and that currently it is just a grassy area used as a parking area. He added that it might end up staying that way, but he wanted the commission to consider giving their approval for a double track parking pad, consisting of two strips with grass in the middle, in case he and his wife decide to go with that plan. Photos showing the proposed bluestone patio and walking stones with wood chips were presented. The plan is to remove an existing brick patio and replace it with bluestone. No other questions were asked. Ms. Litty made a motion to accept the application for 224 S. Morris Street for a walkway, patio, and possible parking area. Chairman Deerin added to the motion the approval of a parking area, as shown on the drawing, consisting of gravel strips with grass in the middle, removal of existing brick walkway and installation of woodchip walkway with random stones and removal of existing brick patio and installation of a new patio using blue stone flagstone as shown on the drawings attached to the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sullivan and unanimously carried with all in favor.
5. Permit #23-19, Richard Leggett, 103 S. Morris Street, two signs facing north and south bound traffic on S. Morris Street for Scottish Highland Creamery. Mr. Leggett was represented by his architect, Cameron MacTavish. Mr. MacTavish explained that the request is to install two signs, one on the north end, and one on the south end of the front of the building, similar to a sign in the center of the building. There would be a gooseneck light in the center that would shine on the signs with no additional lighting being used from the inside. The lettering would match the Scottish Highland Creamery logo. Chairman Deerin noted that there was nothing in the HDC guidelines about signage. Planner Brophy noted that the permit was before the HDC so that they could look over the colors proposed for the signage and that the application would also be going before the Planning Commission for their review. Ms. Litty made a motion that the commission accept the proposal presented by Cameron MacTavish for two, 2-sided signs, with lighting and colors as shown in the application. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor.
6. Permit #23-27, Lisa Quina, 100 W. Division Street, refinish front door and install a sign on building façade approximately 18" x 18". Ms. Quina explained to the members that she was renting the main floor at 100 W. Division Street for the use of an interior design studio and that she wished to have a small sign plaque placed on the building so that people passing by could see what kind of work she did. She presented a concept of the sign consisting of a small, white plaque, with a logo, having a wooden frame around it. In addition to the sign, she also wanted to strip the front door to expose its natural wood look and have it stained. Ms. Quina added that

if the stripping doesn't work, the door would either be painted black or white. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to approve the permit for the request of Lisa Quina for 100 W. Division Street, for the installation of a sign on the building façade as shown in the example and for refinishing the front door to natural wood, and if that is not possible, to paint it white or come back to the HDC for a color choice. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.

7. Permit #23-20, David and Rose Donovan, 203 N. Morris Street, installation of a rooftop HVAC unit on new second story addition on east side behind existing garage. Present was Mr. Donovan who noted that the proposed new unit would not be seen from the front, side, or back of the house, noting that the top of the pitch of the garage is higher than the front wall of the second story addition where the unit will be attached (it was clarified that the unit was not going to be attached to the roof itself). No comments or concerns were made. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to approve the proposal for 203 N. Morris Street, for the installation of an HVAC unit on the second floor, which is not to be visible from any perspective, as shown on the attachments to the application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried with all in favor.
8. Permit #23-21, David and Rose Donovan, 203 N. Morris Street, construction of a pool house and surrounding wood picket fence. Mr. Donovan presented a site plan showing the layout of the pool house, noting that the pool house would not be that highly visible from the street due to the existing vegetation on the property, though it would be more visible from the riverside. The pool house would have siding to match the house and would be 12' x 20'. New fencing would go out from the midpoint of the lot, where it would have gates, and run along the property lines on the north and south sides. A sample was presented as to how the fencing would look. Currently there exists on the south side an old wire fence. Mr. Donovan stated that neither he nor his neighbors on that side wanted to see picket fencing coming down all the way to the river as they now have the ability to look through the wire fencing and have a view of the water. As such, the plan would be to have the picket fencing come part of the way down along the south side and then having it changeover to 4' wire fencing. The members agreed to focus on the plan for the pool house first. Chairman Deerin stated that his only concern with the pool house was with the pitch of the roof being too steep. Mr. Donovan confirmed that that would not be the case and that his understanding was that the pitch of the pool house would compare to the pitch of the two wings of the house. Mr. Donovan presented catalog photos of stonework that was being proposed to go around the swimming pool and asked that the commission, in their motion, to consider approval of the pool house and fencing, as well as a swimming pool and pool decking. Planner Brophy noted that the town did not have construction plans for the swimming pool and would need information on that. Chairman Deerin made a motion that with respect to 203 N. Morris Street, the commission approve the construction of a pool house on the north side of the property in accordance with the design attached to the application and as shown on the plat attached, along with the installation of pool decking, also attached to the permit, showing the type of stone to be used and dimensions as shown on the plat, and the swimming pool itself, though the town will require the applicant to provide more details. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor. In looking over the details concerning the proposed fencing, Chairman Deerin pointed out that the fencing being proposed would be double sided, so that neither the applicant nor the applicant's neighbors would be looking at "the bad side", and went over with the applicant where the new fencing would be located. He

asked how many feet of wire fencing Mr. Donovan was proposing to install on the south side. Mr. Donovan stated it would be between 20 and 25 feet, with the remainder of the fencing being wood. He added that the alternative would be to have wood just a little further down to the edge of the house, so that the wire fencing would just go along the neighbor's swimming pool. Chairman Deerin asked Mr. Donovan if it would be possible to request that his neighbor write a letter for the file stating that he/she has no problem with the Donovans using wire fencing. He added that an appeal won't be taken unless someone initiates it and that he couldn't imagine anyone else doing that except for maybe the neighbor, which was the case in a similar situation that the commission had experienced recently. Mr. Donovan agreed to provide a letter for the file. Chairman Deerin noted, that in this case, the property owner (David Donovan) was replacing an existing wire fence with another wire fence. Planner Brophy asked what kind of wire fencing would be used. Chairman Deerin asked the applicant to provide the commission with an actual type of wire fencing that he would like to use, noting that twisted hoop wire fencing has some historic significance. Chairman Deerin then made a motion that with respect to the fencing at 203 N. Morris Steet, the commission approve the installation of a white picket fence, 4' in height, in the design and construction type as shown in the sample provided with the application, which, on the north side would run from the NW corner of the house down to water, and on the south, run from SW corner of the addition down to approximately 25' before coming to the water and then transition to wire fencing provided the applicant provides a letter from his neighbor on the south side consenting to the use of wire fencing and that the owner specify what type of wire fencing he proposes. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor.

A break was taken from the review of permit applications to consider a series of consultations.

Barbara Meade, property owner of 101 High Street, presented an update on her project to lift her house at 101 High Street. She asked the commission if it would be possible to move her house on to the vacant lot that she owns directly behind it, located on the corner of Market Street and Pork Alley (official address of 200 Market Street). She noted that the guidelines talk about houses being like the others around it and compatible and presented the commission members with a streetscape of Market Street as it exists now. She noted that the first 3 houses on the street appear historic and the ones further down the street being newer construction. If she were to move the house onto the lot on Market Street, she felt it would be compatible in size and height to those around it and would fit into the streetscape better than where it is now. The front porch will be preserved, if at all possible, though the back porch, upon further investigation, has been found to be made of treated wood and having no historic value, will be taken off. Ms. Meade's partner, Pete Linkin, added that they found the profile of the original roof of the back porch that had originally been there but did not know what the original porch might have looked like. A drawing was presented as to what the streetscape would look if the house were to be moved. Ms. Meade added that if the HDC would allow for the moving of the house onto the her vacant lot, she would still want to keep the 2 properties as separate but would like to fence the properties together as if they were one and use Oxford style fencing style to match the fencing the museum has. Chairman Deerin asked how high the foundation of the house would be, if the house were to be moved onto Market Street. Mr. Linkin responded it would be similar to what would be done if the house were to be lifted at the 101 High Street property as the empty lot is not in a flood hazard area. Ms. Meade ventured to ask another question related to the moving of her house onto her vacant lot pertaining to

the side of the house that would face onto Pork Alley. She noted that side of the house would have just a plain wall and that she would like to telescope that side to have a first floor bedroom and just wanted an idea of the feasibility of that. Chairman Deerin responded that the concept she described would fit in with the existing streetscape. However, tearing off the back porch and putting on a new addition would require plans that the HDC would need to look at and review. He added that he thought she could move forward and make an application for moving the house to the vacant lot as she had described. Ms. Meade responded by stating that she could do an addition later but that it would be nice if she could have a foundation put in for an addition at the same time the new foundation for the house was being done. Planner Brophy reminded Ms. Meade she would need to go before the Planning Commission as well because this was an undeveloped property that she was wishing to move her house to and that she was not sure, at this time, what the setbacks were going to be. Chairman Deerin reminded Ms. Meade that she had come before the commission this evening for only a consultation and suggested she make an application for moving the house. Planner Brophy added that Ms. Meade already has her construction plans and that she could use those plans to put towards her new permit to move the house to the Market Street location. Chairman Deerin raised the question as to if there would be any problem with the HDC treating the request to move Ms. Meade's house from where it is now to the lot behind it as an application request. Planner Brophy responded that the agenda didn't actually advertise this as a permit request. Chairman Deerin went ahead and made a motion that with respect to the house at 101 High Street, that the applicant has requested that the existing house at 101 High Street be moved to the 200 Market Street lot, which is on the SE corner of Pork Alley and Market Street, and to only approve the move the house. The motion was seconded by Ms. Litty and unanimously carried with all in favor.

Timothy Kearns, on behalf of Giovanni Salvo, property owner of 512 E. Strand, asked if the commission members had come to any decisions as to what could be done with Mr. Salvo's house following their visit to the Salvo property to examine the house. Chairman Deerin responded that he had given thought to it and stated that the HDC has the ability to bring the matter to the attention of the MD Historic Trust to see if they could take a look at that the property and give their view on the house as well. The commission members all agreed that they should put together an application and send it off to the MD Historic Trust for their review and to wait and see what they come back with.

A final consultation was held with Jim and Diane Ellor, property owners of a vacant lot on Factory Street that runs back towards Banks Street. The Ellors met with the commission to go over their plans for developing the property with a new house and to seek the commission's feedback on what they are thinking about building. Overall, the members liked what the Ellors were presenting. The only question raised was from Chairman Deerin who found the dormers shown on the front side of the house a little unusual for Oxford and reminded the couple that their home would need to fit in with the overall streetscape. Other than that, all the members agreed that the couple had a good overall plan for the property.

This concluded the review of consultations.

One final permit application was discussed as follows:

- Permit #23-22, Jennifer Stanley, 221 South Street, replace wood picket fencing with identical material along southwest corner of property. Mrs. Stanley recused herself from the commission in order to present her application. She stated that she was proposing to replace her existing fencing with new fencing of the same materials as the existing fencing, which is natural wood,

plain picket fencing, in the same location. The new fence will be identical to what is there now, and the only change being made will be to the height, which will be 36", as opposed to the 3' and 4' mix in fence height that is there now, along with the removal of an existing gate, though the space that housed the gate will still remain in place. Chairman Deerin pointed out that the guidelines call for fences to be painted. Mrs. Stanley responded by stating that the new fencing will be stained a weathered gray color. Chairman Deerin made a motion that with respect to Jennifer Stanley's application for 221 South Street, that the permit be approved to replace natural wood pickets with identical fencing as shown on the sketch attached to the application and that the fence will be a uniform 36" where part of it is now 3' and 4', and that it will be stained weathered gray and have no gate at the opening. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Ingram and unanimously carried with all in favor.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby

Assistant Clerk