



OXFORD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
16JUN2023

Date & Time:	16JUN2023 @ 1804
Location:	Oxford Town Hall, Meeting room

Meeting Details	<input type="checkbox"/> Special Session <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular Meeting	
Attendees	<u>AVEO PV</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Derreck Brown, Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Quinn, Vice Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lisa Schon, Secretary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dickon Housman, Treasurer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carla Pruett-DuBois, Member Lillie Armstrong, Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Branch, Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lillie Armstrong, Member <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cheryl Hart, Oxford City Planning Office	<u>Invitees</u> Cynthia Searce, COA Applicant James McCloud, COA Applicant Bill Coburn, COA Applicant Elim Malinowski, COA Applicant James Compton, COA Applicant
Call to Order/Time	1804 by David Quinn, Vice Chair	
Attachments/Links	None	
Approval of Meeting Minutes	Date of Minutes: 14JUN2023 Motion to Approve: Jim Branch Second: Carla Pruett-DuBois Outcome: MAY2023 minutes approved	
Ethics and Conduct Statement	Read by: Jim Branch, Carla Pruett-DuBois Commission Members understand and agree	
Lisa Schon, Secretary, provided the swearing in of the homeowners or representatives for his/her COA presentation. No conflicts were stated.		

COA # 1 Application Review			
Property Address: 400 College Street, NOT IN ATTENDANCE, NOT REVIEWED			
Property Type: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contributing Residential <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Contributing Residential <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial			
Sworn Stakeholders:			
HCO Conflicts of Interest declared: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Other:			
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Factors Considered*	**	Outcome
	Setback/placement of structure		



OXFORD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
16JUN2023

Paint trim, house garage (white to white)- no reviewed, not required History: Previous COA approved for replacement of internal gutters due to failure of internal failure of channel from fascia and soffit, at that time, all internal gutter on top floor was replaced	Exterior Construction Materials		
	Exterior Colors		
	Architectural Details		
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestration		
	General Form and Proportion		
	Appurtenant Fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		
	Trees		

*See attached HPC worksheet for full details of factors considered

** C= Congruent with Historic Aspects for Historic District

NC= Not congruent with Historic Aspects for Historic District

NA= This project does not impact this factor

Discussion:

N/A AS APPLICANT WAS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

Proposed Project Details	Guideline Cited by Applicant	Guideline as per HCP	Decision of HCP
Emergency Roof Repairs			
Front Porch Repairs: Decking, Columns and Trim			
Replace Rotting Wood Siding			
Replace Shutters			
Front Yard Land Scaping			
Repaint House			
Replace Shingles			

Deliberation:

COA Application #2

Property Address: 315 Raleigh St, Beverly S. Royster House, 1900-1902, Shadowesque Colonial Revival Style

Property Type: ☐ Contributing Residential ☒ Non-Contributing Residential ☐ Commercial

Sworn Stakeholders: Courtney Ragan

HCO Conflicts of Interest declared: ☒ None ☐ Other:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Factors Considered*	**	Outcome
Installed "Little Library" feature in front yard, plastic box style feature containing free books, community project for homeowners' children, COA not requested prior to installation (see attachments for pictorial evidence)	Setback/placement of structure		Approved as below
	Exterior Construction Materials	1.C	
	Exterior Colors		
	Architectural Details		
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestration		



OXFORD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
16JUN2023

	General Form and Proportion		
	Appurtenant Fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		
	Trees		

*See attached HPC worksheet for full details of factors considered
 ** C= Congruent with Historic Aspects for Historic District
 NC= Not congruent with Historic Aspects for Historic District
 NA= This project does not impact this factor

Discussion:

- Homeowners received HPC letter via US mail
- Installation was to fulfill homeowner's children's community service through their school
- Homeowner stated that "everyone has posted pictures (on social media), so I guess that's where it came from"
- Pictures reviewed by HPC members along with application
- David- unusual application
 - Cheryl- Derreck posted feature on listserve to see if there was a precedent for this type of feature
 - Basically, this type of feature has been seen, however, each HPC interprets the Style Guidelines differently
 - David- listserve includes HPCs across the state which provides forum for feedback, questions for HPCs
 - Guilford County addressed this type of feature as minor works as part of their guidelines
 - Similar feedback from other HPCs as well
 - Feedback is not consistent throughout the state
 - There have been some approvals for such feature
 - Reference 15.104
 - There is noting in the current guidelines to support or address this type of feature
- Homeowner states, "when we moved in, there were stumps left by previous homeowner, I guess from where they had cut down trees. There is a lot of stuff going on in the house, so I guess no one ever thought about it. I know I should have done this (seek a COA) before we put in the Little Library. I was frustrated when I got the letter, but all my questions were answered. I just feel like it should be across the board to uphold the guidelines. There are several houses with signs in the front yard"
 - Total of 7 stumps removed, left from previous owners
 - Homeowner reviewed Mature Tree Removal guidelines, but did not seek COA for removal of stumps
- David- HPC does not have "guideline police" who go around and make sure that everyone does what they are supposed to
- David- 15.103 may better guideline, however no existing guideline is applicable
- David- this type of feature may need to be addressed in guidelines updates with specific language to support this type of COA
- David- Call attention to 15.300 which addresses mailboxes and street signs
- Dickon- is there a precedent for the feature to be permanently installed
 - David- No existing precedent which presents the current deliberation as to appropriateness of feature
 - Carla- the feature is a great idea, but is not supported by current guidelines
 - David- we do have examples across the state where this type of feature has been approved
- Jim- approved as temporary vs. permanent feature?
- David- the way the guidelines are currently written, feature would fall into "temporary" category
- Lisa- would this fall under 17.104 related signage, guideline read by Lisa Schon
 - Homeowner- Why does this not fall under Landscaping guidelines?
 - Homeowner- everyone has signs in their yards



OXFORD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
16JUN2023

- Lisa explained that the Commission is attempting to find a guideline that fits this feature
- David- this is an exceptional request/application that does not fit any current guideline
 - The charge of the HPC is to review the COA against the current existing guidelines, not what the HPC "thinks is appropriate"
 - This is usually not difficult, however, there is no existing guideline that addresses this type of feature
 - This is a unique COA
 - Agrees that 17.104 is applicable

Proposed Project Details	Guideline Cited by Applicant	Guideline as per HCP	Decision of HCP
Installation of "Little Library" in front of home (at curb)	15.104	15.103, 17.104	Motion to approve to: Dickon Housman Second: Lisa Schon Approved by HCP

Deliberation: No further deliberation was required

COA Application #3

Property Address: 206 Gilliam Street, John Mullins House, circa 1950, Ranch/Colonial Revival

Property Type: ☒ Contributing Residential ☒ Non-Contributing Residential ☐ Commercial

Sworn Stakeholders: Chad Smith

HCO Conflicts of Interest declared: ☒ None ☐ Other:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Factors Considered*	**	Outcome
Build solid 6' high x 10' wide fence on rear of side yard that borders currently vacant corner lots Re-work side fence has been constructed (pictures provided with COA)	Setback/placement of structure		Approved as below
	Exterior Construction Materials	1.C	
	Exterior Colors		
	Architectural Details		
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestration		
	General Form and Proportion		
	Appurtenant Fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		
	Trees		

*See attached HPC worksheet for full details of factors considered

** C= Congruent with Historic Aspects for Historic District

NC= Not congruent with Historic Aspects for Historic District

NA= This project does not impact this factor

Discussion:

- Homeowner apologized for not completing COA prior to work starting
- Homeowner is new to the area, moved to Oxford August 2022
- Wife was in poor health at that time, but is doing well currently



OXFORD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
16JUN2023

- Homeowner has been caregiver for wife but also has a background in home improvement and landscaping
- Felt that vacant lot was an “eye sore” so installed privacy fence (did not seek COA prior to work beginning)
- Received HPC letter
- Homeowner then reviewed guidelines which explicitly states no stockade style fencing, which is what was installed
- Homeowner understands that stockade fencing is not allowed under current guidelines and is willing to “reconstruct” current stockade fence moving to a shadow box picket style fence to maintain privacy fencing
- Homeowner reviewed height of current stockade fencing, which satisfies the current guidelines and current fence construction and specifications
- Homeowner wants to make necessary changes to existing fence to be compliant with current guidelines
- Pictures were reviewed by HPC
- David- Asked from Cheryl- Does “stockade” fencing in guidelines refer to the style of the fence or the pre-fabrication version of the fence available from Lowes or Home Depot?
 - Cheryl confirmed that the guidelines refer to the style
- Homeowner asked when HPC was formed
 - David- 2007 HPC was established
 - Homeowner has noticed several stockade style fences, so was curious as to when HPC was formed with relation to the approval of those existing stockade fences
- Lisa- the fence is not visible from the road, hidden by trees from the Gillam Street side, but it is visible from Spring Street side of property
- Homeowner- understand that there have been approvals for fencing on the corner lots, which served as noise buffer during construction
 - Homeowner- since fence is not visible from Gillam Street, is it possible to make current fence more of a picket style?
 - David- modifying the current fence to make it a picket style would satisfy current guidelines, would require the addition of wood, would not require disassembly
- Homeowner-offered to install pickets on Spring Street side and stain a transparent grey to match the house
 - Homeowner wants to be compliant with current guidelines
 - David- there are historic towns across the state that would appreciate having the historical structures that Oxford currently has

Proposed Project Details	Guideline Cited by Applicant	Guideline as per HCP	Decision of HCP
Build solid 6' high by 10' wide screening fence on rear of side yard that borders currently vacant lots	14.203		Motion to approve to: Jim Branch Second: Carla Pruett-DuBois Approved by HCP
Reword stockade fence panel to shadow box picket fence *Added by HPC- install 6' high pickets on Spring Street side	14.303	14.203	

Deliberation:

Carla- homeowners proposal is a good compromise; goal is not to have homeowner disassemble existing fence and install new one

David- consider, although not in original COA, the design on the Spring Street side includes picket style application on top of existing fence structure to ensure that current COA is “approvable”



OXFORD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
16JUN2023

Dickon- will pickets reach the full height as most pickets are quite small'
Homeowner stated that he will purchase individual boards and have them made into pickets that will reach the full height
David- work must commence within 6 months
Homeowner- will submit COA for further fencing in the future
David- explained exterior features with respect to HPC' s process for approving exterior modifications only, HPC has not jurisdiction over interior modifications
Homeowner- previous homeowner has offered to sell siding which matches current siding, which is beaded siding, but is wood, current siding in not wood. What is the guidance should the homeowner want to replace siding; replace like with like (current is not wood) or replace with historic materials (in this case, non- wood for wood)
David- current siding is Masonite siding, homeowner confirmed not Masonite brand. Replacements could be supported with materials such as pine, given that the home was built circa 1950s
Dickon- current guidelines state that if siding is rotting in a place that is likely to rot again, the replacement should be water resistant/waterproof
Homeowner agrees that Masonite type siding is not waterproof and would replace with warer proof material when need arises

COA Application #4

Property Address: 209 Gilliam Street, H K Council House, circa 1904-1909, Queen Anne style
Property Type: ☒ Contributing Residential ☐ Non-Contributing Residential ☐ Commercial
Sworn Stakeholders: Julia Autry/Tera Autry
HCO Conflicts of Interest declared: ☒ None ☐ Other:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Factors Considered*	**	Outcome
Replace rotten outside ban(d) at porch/deck, replace rotting decking board on porch/deck Replace missing five pieces of wood siding	Setback/placement of structure		Approved as below
	Exterior Construction Materials	1.C	
	Exterior Colors	1.C	
	Architectural Details		
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestration		
	General Form and Proportion		
	Appurtenant Fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		
	Trees		

*See attached HPC worksheet for full details of factors considered

** C= Congruent with Historic Aspects for Historic District
NC= Not congruent with Historic Aspects for Historic District
NA= This project does not impact this factor

Discussion:

Homeowner- base of porch is rotten and needs to be replaced as well as some decking boards on porch. Also, along side of house, some siding boards have fallen off (second item listed on COA), homeowner attempted to reinstall missing boards, but they would not "stay"
David- second request is minor works, Cheryl agrees
David explained minor works, same for same concept
Homeowner agrees that exterior of home should not be changed, states home was her Grandfathers and that she was born in this house, wants to maintain the home only



OXFORD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
16JUN2023

First request exceeds threshold for minor works
Homeowner states she will need railing on porch, not included in current COA so unable to vote on this at this time, however homeowner states understanding that this will require a new COA
Second request, replace missing 5 pieces of wood siding is under minor works and approved by David, Vice Chair, approved by members

Proposed Project Details	Guideline Cited by Applicant	Guideline as per HCP	Decision of HCP
Replace missing five pieces of wood siding	1.105		Approved as minor works
Replace rotten outside ban(d) at porch/deck, replace rotting decking board on porch/deck	7.104, 7.106		Motion to approve to: Carla Pruett-DuBois Second: Dickon Housman Approved by HCP

Deliberation:

Referred HPC members to review pictures
Guidelines a proposed by homeowner are congruent with HPC guidelines

New Business

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
CLG Training	Required to attend to maintain HPC, 3 training available, all onsite with Sanford being the closest HPC/City does not generally provide reimbursement for travel, although this has been done before. Not the usual process, most members pay for themselves	HPC Members to review and decide who will attend
College Street Median	Mayor Sergeant has agreed to provide details of lighting and landscaping and has requested this information from NC DOT NC DOT is pushing forward with the bulb outs and the roundabouts, trying to fast track project to avoid having just dirt in the landscaping space and to avoid missing growing season for landscaping	

Old Business

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
Treasurer's Report	Current: \$2,433.99	Dickon has not yet met with Derreck to review



OXFORD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
16JUN2023

	<p>Previously Reported: Previously reported total was minus adjustments</p> <p>Donations: \$1,529.00 (includes rollover)</p> <p>Remaining Balance after appropriations: \$1,005.88</p>	
Guideline updates	<p>Lisa has running list of proposed updates spanning the last year</p> <p>Will need to address the "one offs"</p> <p>Need to discuss who will handle the updates, not an insignificant time investment</p> <p>Need to consider printing costs, need to have working budget/quote for printing costs for +/- 50 copies</p> <p>Per Cheryl, most recently, only printed copies were created for members as guidelines are available on HPC website for the public</p> <p>Dickon stated that this would be ideal as budgeting for these types of things tends to be a lengthy process</p> <p>Tony Armento has soft copy of guidelines</p> <p>Carla has call with Masonic to discuss Photo Contest printing and will add 10 copies of the guidelines with between 175 and 200 pages with same spiral format for members</p> <p>Will need to load new guidelines to website</p> <p>David proposed a mailing to community, however, currently community goes to HPC website and will see updated guidelines</p>	<p>Carla will reach out to Tony for soft copy of guidelines</p>

PARKING LOT

Motion to Adjourn	1 st	2 nd	Outcome
	Carla Pruett-DuBois	David Quinn	HPC agreed, adjourned at 1850

PARKING LOT

•



OXFORD HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
16JUN2023

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 20JUL2023
MINUTES PREPARED BY: Carla Pruett-DuBois