



<b>Treasury Report</b>	<b>Starting Balance</b>	<b>Expenditures since last meeting</b>	<b>Current Balance</b>
	\$4400.00	Payments were made for the Design Guideline Revision Process as well as our Membership Dues leaving us with our current balance.	\$315.00

**Old Business**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<p><b>Statement of Position and Recommendation in response to request by Oxford Planning Director Cheryl Hart concerning 226 College Street lot</b></p>	<p>Cheryl Hart provided each member a request and methods of handling 226 College Street. At this time, Tony Armento suggested that we reserve our comments for the Commissioners or the Planning Board and only recommend what the HPC can be responsible for. Rick Thomas recused himself for he resides at 224 College St. and feels he may be influenced by this fact. Cheryl Hart introduced Don McLean, from Raleigh who was is requesting an amendment so h a special use permit can be obtained to renovate the property at 226 College St., into a multifamily which is four (4) units. The last use of this property was apartments. There are two (2) factors to be considered here - Historic District and it is zoned R-15. This would require a special use permit in order to renovate this property into a multifamily unit.</p> <p>Mr. McLean spoke, saying that he is interested only if he could restore it to a multi family use and keep it in its original appearance. This is a 5000 square foot dwelling and is on the National Registry and after renovations; we would sell them as condominiums.</p>	<p>Marc Brooks made motion to move forward this recommendation to Cheryl Hart in her capacity as Planning Director concerning her question about the request made of her concerning 226 College St. It was seconded by Christine Sims.</p> <p>The motion is made that we</p>

**More on 226 College  
Street Lot**

Rick Thomas pointed out concerns such as the historic district zoning doesn't allow multifamily use. Cheryl Hart addressed that concern with a solution being stipulating that it could be a multifamily use if that was its last use only. This would keep the historic district intact. Rick also pointed out that multifamily housing does not stabilize and increase economy according to the ordinance and our charter had information that prohibits multifamily conversions.

Susan Wicker of 404 College St. told everyone that it was she that wrote the Ordinance and there is a zoning ordinance for the Historic District as well as the City. The HPC Ordinance doesn't allow multifamily dwellings if they have been nonexistent for more than six (6) months. It then must revert back to its original use which in this case was a single family dwelling. Susan continued with these people are not here to judge whether or not it will look better but whether, as a whole, this is going to be better for the entire district. What you, Mr. McLean are proposing will open up a door to everyone and the next person may not be interested in protecting the historic district.

Mr. McLean finished with the fact that he did not want to open any doors to apartments on College Street or in the historic district but wanted to bring growth to Oxford in a positive way with construction in the historic district. Oxford has potential for growth and it needs this type of housing.

Trudy Roberts informed all that she has roots here and now resides on 112 Rectory Street with a vested interest in community and wants the right kind of growth, even with outsiders and feels the need to preserve these old homes, the integrity and their architecture as condos or anyway we can so educated people will buy them instead of letting them fall down and rot or just stay empty.

Ronnie Ellis spoke next about being from Oxford as a child and pointed out that

adopt it with the additional language to be added given further guidance about the type of ownership structure that the property might enjoy.

The HPC voted unanimously to approve.

**More on 226 College  
Street Lot**

in the Ethics Statement, the word compromise was talked about and he thought that compromise was something that was needed a lot more of in order for Oxford to grow.

Bernard Roberts asked what it would take for this property to remain a single family house. Bernard pointed out that you have this giant house and supposedly had the front of it added on in the 1920's and if you had to tear down the back half of the house, then what would you have?

Susan Wicker answered that there was another one a few houses down and asked what is going to happen with that one? All growth is not smart growth.

Mrs. Rick Thomas made known to everyone that when she and her husband bought their house at 224 College St., they were told there was no way there would be another apartment building next door to them and if she had known there was a chance this was going to happen, they would not have bought that house.

Tony Armento told the audience that Cheryl Hart, on behalf of the City, asked that we give her some input on the matter so that we can offer a recommendation since this is not in our control. At this time Marc wants to go through what the research entails and ask the members whether or not what they heard from the public or whether they have considered anything that might make them deviate from this decision. What Marc would like to do is lay out so the members can understand from a Historic perspective what the thought process was and he ran through it as follows:

- (1) Property was vacant
- (2) It's last use was a three (3) or four (4) individuals apartment

The question before the HPC is to whether continued multifamily use is congruous with the Oxford Historic District.

	<p>**The Draft Letter is Attached</p> <p>Discussion was held about the addition of extra language from the Charter and the Historic Preservation Ordinance.</p>	
<p><b>Statement of Position and Recommendation in response to request by Oxford Planning Director Cheryl Hart concerning New College Street lot</b></p>	<p>Cheryl Hart stated that all members and neighbors had received a letter stating that Ronnie Ellis wanted to have the empty lot on New College Street removed from the Historic District. Debra Crabtree submitted the letter (*letter is included) and also listed this property for Mr. Ellis. Ms. Crabtree stated that when the map was drawn many years ago the warehouse was still there but burned down many years ago leaving this an empty lot. Debra also said that three builders had looked at the property but had decided not to build anything on this lot when they discovered it was in the Historic District but she was unsure why but thought it had something to do with the materials they could or could not use and the strict criteria they would have to follow. Tony questioned her as to why there were misconceptions about the materials, since HPC puts out a booklet of what is allowed and not allowed but the HPC really wanted to understand the argument they had for not wanting to build in the Historic District.</p> <p>Ronnie Ellis spoke up to say that in 1881 an American Tobacco Warehouse was built there and when he bought the property, the Oxford Fire Department wanted to burn it down so he allowed them to do so. According to Mr. Ellis, that is the last connection to the historic district on that street and therefore can't understand why he continues to keep getting rejected from removing his lot from the district. He wants to build apartments there and cannot do so if it is in the historic district.</p> <p>Tony explained to him the HPC only looks at height, placement, color, materials, setback, mature trees, and general form so anyone should be okay to build where only those factors are considered when Debra and Ronnie had said three builders would not build there because of the criteria the HPC placed on builders. Mr.</p>	<p>Rick Thomas made a motion to adopt the recommendation as requested by Cheryl Hart, Planning Director concerning the New College St. Lot with some addition language taking in consideration supporting property values of the Historic District. It was seconded by Kelly Schram.</p> <p>The HPC voted unanimously to approve.</p>

**More on the New  
College St. Lot**

Ellis then said I just want to have it removed from the historic district. Susan Wicker informed everyone that when the National Registry map was being created, the warehouse was there and that's why this property is on the Historic District. It would also cost a lot of money to have it surveyed again to have it taken off so that is why it has remained on there all these years. Susan also explained that the HPC had discussed expanding the district but hadn't had the money to do more surveying and proceeded to tell Mr. Ellis that in the last five to ten years, this property has come up several times before the zoning board with the same request, to build apartments and each time, the neighbors all around this property came out to say they do not want apartments and it is turned down. Susan feels the only reason Mr. Ellis wants to remove it from the historic district is because multifamily housing is prohibited and once Mr. Ellis has it removed from the district, then he will be able to have multifamily apartments. If single family homes were going to be built there, no one would object. Mrs. Wicker also pointed out that if the HPC takes out one vacant lot, then a door will open for all the other vacant lots.

Cheryl Hart suggested that we find a builder to come to a meeting and address our concerns for why they would or would not want to build in the historic district. Tony also thought that it would be beneficial to have a builder address this issue not only for this matter but for future references.

Marc Brooks spoke stating that a letter was formulated on the research that he had compiled on this matter (\*letter is attached). Marc said this was accomplished by deciding how it would impact the Historic District as a whole, by looking at the State of Interior's Standards, and by looking at the Oxford Historic Preservation Ordinance. That is how we make our recommendation. It is clearly stated in the Ordinance 7.42 that we should not remove a vacant lot from the district nor spot zone etc. Marc Brooks asks that the district directly conflicts with the Historic Ordinance and City of Oxford's commitments to the Historic Preservation and

	for that reason we would recommend, a draft recommendation to be considered tonight that the property not be removed from College Street. This was based on our initial research.	
<b>Design Guideline Revision Update</b>	<p>Susan Wicker, our Project Manager, reported that the State Historic Preservation Office has raised two concerns that they want us to reconsider: (1) landscape section (2) exterior walls. Susan will change the new language so that it has a better fit and will send it to the members via email.</p> <p>The Public meeting will now be held in October but no date has been set.</p>	Susan will change the language on the Design Guideline Update and send it to members via email. A public meeting will be held in October but no date has been set as of yet.
<b>National Register Period of Significance Update</b>	Tony informed the commission that there was nothing to report on at this time.	Nothing to report at this time
<b>217 College St.</b>	Cheryl Hart had nothing to report at this time.	No Report
<b>306Broad St. (curb mailbox and side yard fence)</b>	Nothing to report on at this time.	No Report
<b>Walking Tours partnership with Oxford Parks &amp; Recreation Update</b>	Christine Sims reported that Labor Day was the last tour date and 16 people took the tour that day. The Recreation Dept. plans to continue three (3) tours next year due to such positive feedback. They hope to focus on the downtown area with the history of the buildings, the churches in the Historic District, and several different ones. As an HPC, we will begin in January, taking on a new life with the Rec. Dept. and look forward to seeing how much it will grow next year from the 75 people that took the tours this year.	Christine Sims looks forwards to beginning a new year of tours with the downtown area, churches and much more.

## **COA APPLICATION REVIEW #1: Lloyd Bastain**

Property Address: 306 College Street, Oxford, N.C.  
 Sworn stakeholders: Lloyd Bastain  
 Property type: Residential  
 Project type: Completing the driveway with brick pavers to match brick pavers for the sidewalk  
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: None

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Factors Considered *</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>Mr. Bastain was in the process of completing a project that was started in 2004 by installing brick pavers in the driveway to match the brick pavers for the sidewalk.</b>	Height of proposed Structure	N/A	Marc Brooks made a motion to find that the installation of the brick pavers in the driveway at 306 College St. is congruent with the Design Guidelines along with the Historic District as a whole. Christine Sims seconded it.  The HPC voted unanimously to approve.
	Setback/placement of structure	N/A	
	Exterior Construction Materials	C	
	Exterior Colors	C	
	Architectural Details	N/A	
	Roof (shape/form/materials)	N/A	
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations	N/A	
	General form and proportion	N/A	
	Appurtenant fixtures	N/A	
	Structural Conditions	N/A	
	Trees	N/A	

--	--	--	--

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

**COA APPLICATION REVIEW #2:Cindy Bostic**

Property Address: 104 E. Front Street, Oxford, N.C.  
 Sworn stakeholders: Cindy Bostic  
 Property type: Residential  
 Project type: Change exterior color of house from white to light green color  
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: None

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
<b>The Homeowner, Mrs. Bostic, would like to change the exterior color of her home from white to a light green color (white sage). The trim will remain white and shutters will remain black. Porches do not need painting at this time.</b>  <b>Color sample is included **</b>	Height of proposed Structure	N/A	Kelly Collins Schram made a motion to find that changing the exterior color of the house on 104 E. Front St. from white to white sage is congruent with the Design Guidelines and the Historic District as a whole. It was seconded by Marc Brooks.
	Setback/placement of structure	N/A	
	Exterior Construction Materials	N/A	
	Exterior Colors	C	
	Architectural Details	N/A	
	Roof (shape/form/materials)	N/A	
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations	N/A	
	General form and proportion	N/A	
	Appurtenant fixtures	N/A	
	Structural Conditions	N/A	
	Trees	N/A	

			The HPC voted unanimously to approve.
--	--	--	---------------------------------------

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

**COA APPLICATION REVIEW #3: Donald and Mary Wright**

Property Address: 104 Rectory Street, Oxford, N.C. 27565  
Sworn stakeholders: Donald and Mary Wright  
Property type: Residential  
Project type: (1) Construct a six foot privacy fence along the sides and rear of property lines, (2) Replace gravel driveway with concrete (3) Build a one foot retaining wall approximately 15 to 20 feet at entryway of drive for erosion purposes and (4) Stain existing concrete walkway and steps to match brick on house

HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: None

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
The Homeowners, Mr. and Mrs. Wright would like to:	Height of proposed Structure	1,3C 2,4N/A	(1) Kelly Schram made the motion to approve

<p><b>(1) Construct a six (6) foot wooden privacy fence along the rear and side property lines. This will be adjacent to the already existent chain link fence in the rear and sides of the property and will have two gates. The wood fence will be painted white.</b></p> <p><b>(2) Replace gravel driveway with concrete which will be stamped with designs at the very front and in a natural concrete color</b></p> <p><b>(3) Build a one foot tall stone veneered retaining wall approximately 15 to 20 feet at the entryway of drive for erosion purposes.</b></p> <p><b>(4) Apply brick red stain on existing walkway and stairs (steps) to match dark red brick on house.</b></p> <p><b>** Some pictures are included</b></p> <p><b>Two neighbors in the audience were in favor of this COA from 112 Rectory St. and 302 College St.</b></p>	Setback/placement of structure	1,3-C 2,,4-N/A	<p>the construction of a six foot wooden fence painted white for side and rear of yard and with mitigating factor in respect to landscape impacting mature trees as congruent with Oxford Design Guidelines and the Historic District as a whole. It was seconded by Christine Sims.</p> <p>(2)Rick Thomas made a motion to approve the stamped concrete driveway in the natural concrete color as congruent with the Oxford Historic District and Design Guidelines. It was seconded by Christine Sims.</p> <p>(3) A motion was</p>
	Exterior Construction Materials	1 ,2,3,4-C	
	Exterior Colors	1,2,3,4-C	
	Architectural Details	1,2,3,4-N/A	
	Roof (shape/form/materials)	1,2,3,4-N/A	
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations	1,2,3,4-N/A	
	General form and proportion	1,3,-C 2,4-N/A	
	Appurtenant fixtures	1,3-C 2,4-N/A	
	Structural Conditions	1,3-C 2,4-N/A	
Trees **	** (1)Required removal of two mature trees and was allowed as mitigating factor to allow work- NC 2,3,4-N/A		

		<p>made by Christine Sims that all the terms of the retaining wall are congruent with the Historic District and the Design Guidelines and it be approved as submitted. Marc Brooks seconded it.</p> <p>(4) Marc Brooks made a motion to find that the staining of the walkway and steps in the red brick color to be congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines and to approve. Kelly Schram seconded it.</p> <p>The HPC voted unanimously to approve all four (4) projects as submitted.</p>
--	--	--

\* See attached HPC worksheet for full details of factors considered

\*\* C = Congruent with Historic Aspects of Historic District

NC = Not Congruent with Historic Aspects of Historic District

NA = This project does not impact this factor

**Summary of Approved Minor Work: There have been no minor works at this time.**

**COA Renewal: There were no COA Renewals at this time.**

**Demolition by Neglect: Nothing at this time.**

**New Business**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>Amendment to Design Guideline Delay</b>	Tony Armento contacted Ramona Bartos with the State Preservation Office Director and asked if there was any way we could help Marc Brooks move forward with his building projects, which has been on hold due to our Design Guideline Delays. Ramona told Tony to amend our Guidelines for this one item so the homeowner would not be held up any longer. The issue is fiber cement	Christine Sims made a motion to allow the HPC to amend our current guidelines to include (which the State approved) Fiber Cement siding on new

	and it is allowed in the revision by the State so Tony needed to bring it before the HPC in order to allow this revision.	construction buildings to include primary and secondary structures. Rick Thomas seconded it.  The HPC voted unanimously to approve.	
<b>Continuing HPC Training</b>  <b>2017 Photo Contest categories and Stewardship Award policy</b>  <b>Review and update of 2016 Goals</b>	<b>Tony Armento tabled these until our October Meeting!</b>	All were tabled until October Meeting.	
<b>Motion to Adjourn</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup></b>	<b>Outcome</b>
	Kelly Schram	Marc Brooks	By unanimous decision, the Board adjourned at 9:16pm.

**Date of Next Meeting: Thursday, October 20, 2016**

**Minutes Prepared by: Lu Anne Gilligan**