

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes April 15, 2021

Call to Order	In Attendance	Absent	Guests
<p>Made by: Derreck Brown</p> <p>Time: 6:03p.m.</p>	<p>Derreck Brown-Chairman Lisa Schons-Secretary David Quinn - Member Kelly Collins-Schram -Member Dickon Housman- Member Cheryl Hart-Planning Director</p> <p>**Ethics Statements read by: Derreck Brown</p>	<p>Tony Armento – Vice Chairman</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dan & Martha Gordon, COA Submission 2. Marc Brooks, COA Submission 3. Paul Wilson, COA Submission 4. Margaret Stanley, COA Submission 5. Derreck Brown, COA Submission

Approval of Minutes	Date of Minutes	Motion to Approve	2 nd	Outcome
	3/18/2021	David Quinn	Dickon Housman	All Members Approved

Treasury Report	Starting Balance	Expenditures since last meeting	Current Balance
	<p style="text-align: center;">\$1490.00</p> <p>No other expense other than recording secretary fee since last meeting.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">\$320.00 set aside for medallion</p> <p style="text-align: center;">\$432.00 for recording secretary until June.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">\$389.00*</p> <p>(*Special Purpose Contest fund can be carried year to year) No disbursements since August</p>	<p>\$85.00 – recording secretary fee</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">\$432.00 for remainder of the year</p>

Summary of Approved Minor Works: 218 College Street

Lisa Schons provided the swearing in of the home owners for their COA presentation. No conflicts were stated.

COA APPLICATION REVIEW #1: Dan & Martha Gordon

White Britt House c. 1880

Property Address: 607 College Street, Oxford NC 27565
 Sworn stakeholders: Don Gordon
 Property type: Contributing Residential
 Project type: Replace of damaged walkway
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: None

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
<p>The property owner is requesting COA approval to</p> <p>1. Replace damaged walkway in front of house with 4 inch thick walkway from a 1 inch walkway. Will use concrete. Walkway will be same layout and expansion joint will be the same as now. The color will match the city sidewalk in front of the home.</p> <p>This is the 2nd time the Gordan's have presented to the Commission. The Commission asked the Gordon's to do additional research regarding aggregate gravel or pavement. On March 23, Martha sent email stating that after the meeting the contractor stated he could get river rock aggregate and do exposed aggregate finish that matches what is currently in place. The aggregate river rock will be utilized.</p>	Height of proposed Structure		<p>1. Kelly Collins – Schram made a motion that the COA is congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 13.102 and should therefore be approved.</p> <p>It was seconded by David Quinn.</p> <p>The HPC voted unanimously to approve.</p>
	Setback/placement of structure		
	Exterior Construction Materials	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Exterior Colors	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		
	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Appurtenant fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		
Trees			

* 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: Marc Brooks

Mattie Hobgood house c.1906

Property Address: 218 College Street, Oxford NC 27565
 Sworn stakeholders: Marc Brooks
 Property type: Contributing Residential
 Project type: Replace rotted wood, replace rotted/missing soffit and fascia, scrape and repaint, replace asphalt roof, remove exterior fire escape
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: None

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
<p>The property owner is requesting COA approval to</p> <p>1. Replace minimal amount of rotted or damaged wood siding with similar wood siding (more than 20 square feet). Entire home is wood siding.</p> <p>2. Replace rotted/missing soffit and fascia with wood or utilize fiber cement if water infiltration is an issue. Use of fiber cement will be limited to roof lines only and all historic detail will be preserved. No siding would be replaced with fiber cement.</p> <p>3. Hand scrape exterior and paint the same color (this is a minor works) Cheryl and Derreck approved this.</p> <p>4. Remove existing asphalt shingle roof and replace with like color asphalt shingle roof. 3 tab to 3 tab architectural has been approved for in the past.</p>	Height of proposed Structure		<p>1. David Quinn made a motion that the COA is congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 1.100, 1.103, 1.106, and 1.202 and should therefore be approved.</p> <p>It was seconded by Lisa Schones.</p> <p>The HPC voted unanimously to approve.</p> <p>2. Lisa Schons made a motion</p>
	Setback/placement of structure		
	Exterior Construction Materials	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Exterior Colors	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		
	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Appurtenant fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		
Trees			

<p>5. Remove rotting exterior fire escape and second story door (temporarily cover opening and eventually replace with appropriate window after seeking HPC approval). Door and fire escape not original to the home. Replace section with wood siding for now. Goal is to find a historic window that matches in the future, but for now, it will be wood siding currently on the home. Owner stated his goal is for it to look like a finished wall.</p> <p>Lisa will make a note of this to discuss and modify the wording for 6.107.</p>		<p>that the COA is congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 1.200 and should therefore be approved.</p> <p>It was seconded by David Quinn.</p> <p>The HPC voted unanimously to approve.</p> <p>3. Hand scrape is a minor works and was approved by Derreck and Cheryl.</p> <p>4. Lisa Schons made a motion that the COA is congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 5.104</p>
--	--	---

and should therefore be approved.

It was seconded by Kelly Collins-Schram.

The HPC voted unanimously to approve.

5. David Quinn made a motion that the COA is congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 6.107. Request #5 is congruent with 6.107 with stipulation that exterior wall will include traditional wood siding and should therefore be approved.

		<p>It was seconded by Lisa Schons.</p> <p>The HPC voted unanimously to approve.</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



COA APPLICATION REVIEW #3: Paul Wilson

Sidney Cuts House c. 1931

Property Address: 201 E. Front Street, Oxford NC 27565
 Sworn stakeholders: Paul Wilson
 Property type: Contributing Residential
 Project type: Tree removal
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: None

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
The property owner is requesting COA approval to 1. Removal of 2 dangerous and unsightly pine trees from Gilliam side of house. Provided HPC with a letter from an official arborist for recommendation.	Height of proposed Structure		1. Kelly Collins-Schram made a motion that the COA is congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 15.102 and should therefore be approved. It was seconded by David Quinn. The HPC voted unanimously to approve.
	Setback/placement of structure		
	Exterior Construction Materials	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Exterior Colors	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		
	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Appurtenant fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		
Trees			

* 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 #4: Margaret Shanley

Medford-Washington House c. 1926

Property Address: 208 Front Street, Oxford NC 27565
 Sworn stakeholders: Margaret Stanley
 Property type: Contributing Residential
 Project type: Re-Paint Trim
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: None

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
<p>The property owner is requesting COA approval to 1. Brighten trim color by painting. Looked at arts and crafts type paint. Meadow Sage Sherwin Williams color for trim.</p>	Height of proposed Structure		1. Dickon Housman made a motion that the COA is congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 4.100, 4.101, 4.102 and 4.103 and should therefore be approved.
	Setback/placement of structure		
	Exterior Construction Materials	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Exterior Colors	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		
	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C 3.C	It was seconded by David Quinn.
	Appurtenant fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		The HPC voted unanimously to approve.
	Trees		

* 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 #5: Derreck Brown

James Currin House c.1886

Property Address: 213 High Street, Oxford NC 27565
 Sworn stakeholders: Derreck Brown
 Property type: Contributing Residential
 Project type: Masonry on 4 chimneys
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: None

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
The property owner is requesting COA approval to 1. Masonry on 4 chimneys. Open up all breached joints, repoint with type S mortar. Replace with the same material as currently on the home. Brick will not be painted since it is not currently painted.	Height of proposed Structure		1. Kelly Collins-Schram made a motion that the COA is congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 3.100 and 3.103 and should therefore be approved.
	Setback/placement of structure		
	Exterior Construction Materials	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Exterior Colors	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		It was seconded by David Quinn. The HPC voted unanimously to approve.
	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C 3.C	
	Appurtenant fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		
	Trees		

* 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

Old Business

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
(1) This Old House Article	Derreck provided an update that the article would be finalized prior to the May meeting.	(1) This Old House Article – Lisa and David will review along with Derreck to finalize.
(2) Signage Markers	<p>David had stated at a former meeting the idea of historical signage in front of the homes to assist with walking tours. He shared examples of signage from New England and Edenton to be in front of home or in several locations. This was discussed as a potential enhancement to the historic district. He stated that the size, content, placement, etc. will be researched. If the HPC agrees, he will complete the research and present at the next meeting.</p> <p>Dickon asked how the project would be rolled out, how it will be funded and if placed in front of homes, how will that work? David stated that funding would be via sponsors, homeowner, or an organization. As for content, the HPC would need to discuss guidelines regarding interior pictures and only featuring non-personal information. Architectural features would be featured on the signage. He stated that the planning department would be key in placement of the signage. The City would have to approve and the homeowner would also need to approve. Cheryl stated that signage cannot be placed in the utility strip in front of homes.</p>	(2) Signage Markers – The HPC decided to move forward and David will provide further information at the May meeting. The HPC prefers the smaller version of the signage for future discussion.

(3) COA Examples

At the last meeting, David suggested a way to better process COA's. He suggested that the HPC create example narratives defining what may be successful and what may not be successful using photos and other information for COA submissions. This would be a companion to our guidelines. The examples will be close to our guidelines. The examples would provide additional data for applicants to assist with a successful submission. It would also assist with positive conversations on future COA submissions. The Initial thought was using some of our recent applications as examples for roofing repair/replacements, and the 5-7 themes we have seen lately. Is there legal implications in using someone's pictures or submission? The HPC would remove all identifying information in all examples. Is the HPC required to obtain approval to create artificial examples that are not tied to a specific homeowner? The HPC discussed that only examples with no personal identification would be utilized. A generic name and address would be used on all examples. This process protects COA submission information. The HPC also discussed that it would be helpful to have additional data available to the public to assist them in submitting COA's for review. The HPC agreed that reviewing the guidelines can be confusing and intimidating and this would help present the data in a more user friendly environment. This would be sort of a do's and don't section of the website. The HPC wants a positive outcome as much as possible for homeowners.

It was discussed that no member can influence the applications or engage with applicants prior to a meeting. Derreck is sending the

(3) COA Examples – *The HPC agreed that having examples of approvals and denials would help homeowners with future COA submission. No personal information would be shared on examples.*

The HPC agreed to try COA examples, and Derreck will review future applications to ensure if anything is missing that may cause a denial, he can bring that to Cheryl's attention and they can determine together whether it is something that should be communicated with the homeowner or not.

email and applications on the Monday prior to each meeting. The question was asked if the chair could do an earlier review to determine if certain things are missing in addition to Cheryl doing this? Cheryl reviews and sends COA's and does not provide any comments since she is not on the board and could be construed telling the board how to vote. If Derreck reviewed, provided feedback if in alignment with guidelines, and then the owner can then decide to continue to present at the meeting or provide additional information so that the COA is in line with the current guidelines. Lisa stated this could also help the homeowner provide additional information like what color paint will be used, etc. This prevents the homeowner from then having to return to the next meeting to update the HPC. Dickon stated there may be missing information so sharing an example that was successful would give the homeowner further information and the opportunity to update their submission, should they choose. He stated that this allows the homeowner to have information and have a full view of what is expected. Kelly stated she felt this was great and would help improve the HPC reputation.

David asked if information provided is part of public record? Derreck stated that Yes; it goes into the minutes. Once Cheryl receives something it is public record.

New Business

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
--------------	-------------------	----------------

**(1) HPC Member
Vacancy**

Mike Delionbach resigned and his services were greatly appreciated during his tenure. He recently retired and wants to focus on other things.

**(2) Main Street
Home Update**

Unfortunate news to share. Derreck provided an update regarding the roofing request on the home on Main Street that was denied. The homeowner proceeded with replacing the roof.

Derreck stated that the home on Main Street presented to the COA Standing Seam Grooved. Application was denied based on what was presented to the HPC. Standing Seam Grooved was installed even after HPC denied. Cheryl went over and took photos and spoke with the contractors. A letter was sent to the homeowner. The building inspection went to the home and spoke to contractor who stated they were only replacing shingles with shingles. The next couple of days, they were replacing metal and Cheryl went over and she had left her card for owner. The contractor stated he was under impression that owner had contacted Cheryl. The contractor stopped working but over the weekend started the work back. Cheryl stated that not obtaining approval could hurt the sale of the home as it did to a home on College Street since no paperwork would be on file of the approval. She stated a letter had been sent to the home on Main Street to cease work or legal action would be sought. The HPC has no say whether anything happens after the

**1) HPC Member
Vacancy-** *Derreck will let the clerk know and asked if the HPC members knew of anyone that would be interested.*

denial. Derreck stated that any future actions will be handled by the City of Oxford.

(3) Terms

Kelly stated that her term was up in July. Derreck stated this would be discussed in length at the next meeting.

(4) General Discussion of irrigation diverter and College Street medians

Discussed closure of the irrigation diverters on College Street. The HPC discussed having closure regarding the irrigation diverters on college street. Cheryl and Derreck stated additional information was provided to water and sewer and inspections departments that provide permits for that device. Cheryl spoke with Steven Inscoe to ensure that he is communicating to individuals that these devices are not put in locations that are not approved. If the devices have been installed, the homeowner is required to add foliage around the device. He stated he would provide this information to homeowner. He also stated that he would review registered historic list of homes and advise the homeowner that a COA submission is required to the HPC.

A question was asked regarding the College Street median, and if there is any action needed by the HPC? Cheryl stated she will have a conversation with the City Manager regarding this median. She will report back to the HPC at the May meeting.

Consistency with roundabouts, the DOT required this to be done but not the median. The DOT was required to get review from HPC for the roundabout but not for the median. It will be a while before the median work is started but the roundabout work will begin in May.

2. HPC Reputation Discussion

Derreck brought up that the reputation of the HPC needs to be worked on and improved. He stated that discussions needed to be held regarding how the HPC is perceived by the community. The commission discussed that suggesting the signage markers, providing examples for future COA Submissions, etc should assist with improving the reputation and perception of the HPC. He stated we need to ensure that the HPC does it's best to be supportive as possible.

The HPC agreed that we want to see things preserved and made better. Derreck will reach out and schedule time with the City Manager and introduce himself. He stated he would share how the HPC is moving forward in our vision statement and how the HPC can work with the city to find a middle ground and balance. It was discussed that building the relationship is an important start.

David asked if the next step should be to write an article in the newspaper describing what the HPC does and share the percentage of submissions that the HPC approves. He asked if the board could be provided with the overall report in May-June and utilize that information to create the article. All members of the HPC agreed with this idea.

2) HPC Reputation:
Derreck has reached out to the City Manager to develop and foster a relationship with the HPC.

David suggested an article in the local newspaper.

Motion to Adjourn	1st	2nd	Outcome
	David Quinn	Lisa Schons	The HPC adjourned at 7:48p.m.

Date of Next Meeting: **Thursday, May 20, 2021**

Minutes Prepared by: **Lou Ann Mitchell**