

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes August 20, 2020

Call to Order	In Attendance	Absent	Guests
<p>Made by: Lou Ann Mitchell</p> <p>Time: 6:03 p.m.</p>	<p>Derreck Brown-Chairman Tony Armento – Vice Chairman Lisa Schons-Secretary Mike Delionbach- HPC Member David Quinn- HPC Member Teresa Gilbreath Cheryl Hart-Planning Director</p> <p>**Ethics Statements read by: Derreck Brown</p>	<p>Jacalyn Thomas Kelly Collins-Schram Lou Mitchell – Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Braxton Henderson & Chalise COA Submission</p> <p>Dicken Houseman COA Submission</p>

Approval of Minutes	Date of Minutes	Motion to Approve	2 nd	Outcome
	July 17, 2020	Mike Delionbach	David Quinn	Approved

Corrections to minutes: Tony suggested that we do not use we, us, etc. when referring to the committee. He stated we should use The Committee. He also stated a correction should be made in that he is not in favor of applications fees except for after the fact applications.

Treasury Report	Starting Balance	Expenditures since last meeting	Current Balance
	<p style="text-align: center;">\$</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(new balance due to non payment of Domain.com fee not being paid.)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2k from city</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The commission a remainder of the 11k donation gifted for the Oxford Historic expansion</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The commission should receive a \$500 donation for the special pupose fund which will bring the total to \$889.00</p> <p style="text-align: center;">\$389.00*</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(* Special Purpose Contest fund can be carried year to year)</p>	<p>\$85.00 – recording secretary fee</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">\$1915.00</p>

Old Business

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
<p>Update on Oxford Historic District</p>	<p>Nothing has changed other than at the February Commissioners meeting they did approve the Historic Preservation fund for the Military/Williamsboro Street & Armory District. Thanks to Cheryl for being present at the meeting and</p>	<p><i>Military/Williamsboro Street & Armory District approved at last Commissioner's meeting.</i></p>

<p>2020 Goals/Visibility initiatives updates</p>	<p>answering questions on the HPC’s behalf. Everything else has been stalled at the State office.</p>	
<p>(1) Welcoming Program Activities</p>	<p>Derreck stated the welcome packages were delivered to Kelly with the bags, magnets and pens. The pads were ordered about a week or so ago and should be in soon. The The Commission needs to get traction on this project and get the trifold brochure, letter and bags out to the new people in the community so that they are aware who the HPC is and can review the guidelines. Derreck will check with Kelly to see how this is going and if she is not able to get this completed, he will take this over and will deliver the bags. Tony suggested a nice welcome letter be included along with the guidelines <i>(agreed and will be included)</i>.</p> <p>David suggested we have something shared on the front end of the buying process with a realtor. It was discussed that the realtor is not responsible for providing this information. He asked if the HPC documentation could be included in the purchase package, sort of like the HOA is noted. The Commission discussed that some realtors do not want to include this type of information in a packet. The Commission should try to engage and find a way for realtors to be involved and inform potential buyers of the HPC.</p>	<p><i>(1) Welcoming Program – Derreck provided an update on the bags and delivery of ordered pads. Tony suggested a letter in the bag. Derreck will work with Kelly and expedite having bags hung on doors.</i></p>
<p>(2) Public Ledger Articles</p>	<p>Derreck will work with Kelly to get traction on this. David stated that Carmen has sent photos and reached out to former owners and has shared everything they have. The Commission does not know where the project stands and will ask Kelly for a draft of what she has to date. David suggested the person that lives next to the funeral home would be a wealth of information.</p>	<p><i>(2) Public Ledger Articles – Derreck will follow up with Kelly to see where she is on the project and get a draft from her. The current goal is to complete this by September</i></p>

<p>(3) Stewardship Award</p>	<p>Derreck reached out to Jacqueline and asked for her vote but has not heard back from her. The Commission decided that based on the responses received, the award goes to 114 High Street. Derreck will get the award from Cheryl and will work with Tony on a way to present it to her at a Board of Commissioners zoom meeting or some other public forum. Tony stated it is usually followed up with a newspaper announcement. Derreck stated he has the draft from past winners.</p>	<p><i>2020 which gives time for the commission to review.</i></p> <p><i>(3)Stewardship award – Derreck and Tony will get together on the newspaper announcement. Derreck suggested we add to the September commissioner meeting agenda if the agenda is not too full. Cheryl and Derreck will work on this.</i></p>
<p>(4) SHPO Virtual Training Update</p>	<p>Derreck asked David and Lisa to let the commission know how the training has been so far. David stated he has done two sessions and has one to do next week. He encouraged all members to watch the second one as it gives a great overview and is very informative. It takes about an hour. Lisa is in the middle of her 3rd session and also suggested that everyone listen to the sessions.</p>	<p><i>(4) SHPO Virtual Training update - David and Lisa provided an update and are enjoying the classes. Derreck reminded them to send the required documentation to Christy to ensure we keep our certification and asked him to send to all commission members.</i></p>
<p>(4) 2020 Annual Report</p>	<p>Derreck reported that the 2020 Annual Report has been submitted.</p>	<p><i>(4) 2020 Annual Report – Cheryl has it and stated it will be presented at the September Commissioner’s meeting.</i></p>

<p>(5) Irrigation System Backflow Devices follow-up</p>	<p>Derreck stated the goal is for him and Cheryl to draft something to send to Steve Inscoe. Cheryl stated she had sent a list of addresses to Mr. Inscoe but not a letter. Derreck and Cheryl work together to draft a letter/document and follow up. They will make sure Steve has document. David asked if there was any benefit in sending mailer to the addresses in the historic district to remind them that a COA is needed for backflow units? Tony brought up the fact that the water department should pay for this. He suggested that the city could add something to bills that are sent to owners to help them understand the installation process and the HPC involvement. Tony stated the commission should think about how to handle the ones that have already had the devices installed.</p>	<p><i>Derreck confirmed that it will be posted on HPC website.</i></p> <p>(5) Irrigation System Backflow Devices followup – Derreck and Cheryl will work on a draft to send to Steve Insko.</p>
<p>(6) Online Inventory</p>	<p>Derreck stated the site continues to be updated. David suggested a user be able to hover over the picture to get the address and not have to click into it to see it.</p>	<p>(6) Online Inventory - Derreck will update the website to allow users to see address when hovering over the photo.</p>
<p>(7) PocketSights.com</p>	<p>Derreck stated Ms. Mary Yount, Downtown Economic Development Director for the City of Oxford, asked about the walking tours. Currently, the Commission is looking at October. This may be pushed out further due to COVID.</p> <p>Ms. Yount also asked about the possibility of being able to create videos with a person standing in front of their home with the home’s basic information. She suggested a 45 second to one minute video that could be posted on facebook.com and/or youtube.com. David suggested a video regarding a feature as to the entire contents of the home. Derreck restated that Ms. Yount asked that the homeowner</p>	<p>(7) PocketSights.com – Derreck will followup with Ms. Yount regarding a person who could provide the videography for the homes. Derreck will also clarify with Ms. Yount the video details and ascertain costs.</p>

stand in front of their home and have a quick dialogue regarding the home. The Commission had a discussion in the last meeting regarding videos of the home and discussed having the video only focus on the historical architecture importance of the home to ensure no personal items are posted on the internet. David suggested the commission solicit someone from the state that has technical expertise, content in historical videos and how to ensure to explain to viewer why the particular home or architectural feature is historical. The Commission feels the dialogue is important and provide a video that is historical and meaningful.

Tony suggested we needed more than 45 seconds and this may also take away from the walking tour. He stated if it is available on the website then people are less likely to attend the walking tour.

Tony stated Derreck planned to record all pocketsight.com videos. The Commission agreed that it was a good idea for the property owner to stand in front of their home and give a brief overview of that home. The Commission stated it was very nice to see different people at each of the stops you make. The Commission liked this idea and thought it would add a personal touch. Suggestions for the video included, the history, architectural features to that home and a bit about families that lived in the home. The question remained, "Would this detract from people doing the walking tour if this is available?"

The Commission discussed it would be nice to be able to stand in front of a home and press something on your smart phone that would give you a brief history of that home and property. It was also discussed it would be a special touch if someone did this, if the owner were home and came out to talk to that person.

Derreck will work on setting up a YouTube site that is for the HPC to have access to any videos posted.

David will help with this process.

(8) HPC Photo Contest

Derreck will check the site but as of the time of this meeting, it did not appear that the Commission has enough people to do this. The Commission discussed how to do contests such as this during the COVID pandemic. It was suggested to do a best of photo from previous years. The commission would review all photos from past 8 years. There would not be a prize, just recognition of best photo. It was also suggested that the Commission extend this contest for a year so that it could be done like it was proposed to. There was discussion about having the community submit seasonal photos that would be viewable on the HPC website. It was also suggested that the pictures be made more prominent on the HPC website and the City of Oxford website. Derreck stated that the City of Oxford does utilize some of the photos from the HPC website.

(8) HPC Photo Contest - Derreck will check the site and see if we have enough photos but as of yesterday, it did not. He will report back to the committee.

All COA applicants were sworn in by Lisa Schons and Tony Armento

COA APPLICATION REVIEW #1: Dickson and Anna Housman

(Bullock-Cruise House c.1903)

Property Address: 306 Broad Street, Oxford, NC 27565
 Property type: Residential/Contributing
 Project type: Structure, Roof, architectural details
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: None

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
<p>The property owner is requesting COA approval to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wood siding 2. Trim corner boards 3. Water table 4. Freize board 5. Fascia and soffit 6. Columns/posts 7. Handrails 8. Roofing 9. Gutters & downspouts 10. Chimneys 11. Windows - wood windows without storm windows - Muntons would be wood simulated divided 12. Window trim details 13. Doors - replace with Fiberglass that looks like wood 14. Door Trim 15. Paint 	Height of proposed Structure		<p>1. Tony Armento made a motion that the COA should be approved for all sections submitted since its congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines based on 11.100, 11.101, 11.102, 11.103, 11.104, 11.105, 11.107, 11.200, 11.202, so therefore all sections should be approved.</p> <p>It was seconded by David Quinn</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>16. Foundation 17. Back patio and pergola 18. Walkway (from driveway to back door) 19. Fence and gate Muntons would be wood simulated divided</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

Property Address: 316 Main Street, Oxford, N.C. 27565
 Sworn stakeholders: Braxton Henderson
 Property type: Residential
 Project type: Roof repair, replacement and paint request
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared:

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome	
<p>The property owner is requesting COA approval to Prior COA denied in July 2020 and was brought back with new request with additional information. Derreck reviewed the Historic society guidelines 2017 page 17 #10, if the HPC denies the original COA, the applicant can submit a new COA Also, a review of page 23 states an applicant may revise and can resubmit the COA for review. Derreck stated the application was substantial.</p> <p>1. Replace rotting roof with Grand Manor shingle from CertainTeed. Homeowner provided additional information from an email from Mitch Wilds, NC State Historic Preservation Office and Derreck shared his conversation with Mitch. Mr. Wilds would not be able to have an in person meeting but did come by and look and take photos. After reviewing the overall roof structure but basing on the roof itself, the form and slope of the roof would need to be maintained. It is a low hip roof and once you get to eaves of it, it flares out. He stated the need ensure flaring component stays true to home. Ensure that the form and slope are maintained – homeowner stated he had discussed</p>	Height of proposed Structure		<p>1. Tony Armento made a motion to approve the COA since the application be congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 5.104 and not in conflict with 5.203 in addition to 5.100 and 5.103 in respect of the slope, pitch and ornamentation therefore should be approved.</p> <p>It was seconded by Mike Delionbach</p>	
	Setback/placement of structure			
	Exterior Construction Materials			
	Exterior Colors	1.C 3.C		
	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C		
	Roof (shape/form/materials)	1.C		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations			
	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C 3.C		
	Appurtenant fixtures			
	Structural Conditions			
Trees				

<p>that with contractor. Ornamental metal work on top of roof should be maintained and homeowner confirmed that this was discussed and will be done. The Commission had a question: What is number of years shingle is rated for? 50 year warranty</p> <p>Two statements were made: Replacing decking, that would infer there is a dimensional change on the perimeter on the trim? Will you make changes to roofline? Homeowner stated he would not.</p> <p>Commission member David Quinn Statement: Slate roof life expectancy is around 65 – 85 years. He is conflicted as he reads page 49, reviewing 5.203 which is in in conflict with several of the 5.101 and 5.102 general guidelines. If we choose to approve, it will set a precedent. He is afraid that there will not be a slate roof left in Oxford. He feels everyone will take this path if we do this. Not much more important and historic than a slate roof. Setting a very specific pattern. Derreck stated that on page 22, bullet 6 roof maintained or restored that is congruent to the surrounding buildings. Page 48 Chapter 5.5 and 4.5 if the historic roof needs to be replaced original material should be used unless not available or not affordable and substitute material must match. 5.203 substitute that closely resembles will be considered. The Commission’s ethical responsibility is to ensure material that can be substituted can be used if within the application of the guidelines.</p> <p>HPC Member Tony Armento: Thanked applicants for returning to the drawing board and returning with</p>		<p>The HPC voted unanimously to approve.</p>
---	--	--

<p>additional information and asking the State's office for advice. Very commendable.</p> <p>HPC Chairman Derreck: Were the construction issues addressed with the construction team? If you are replacing the decking, and how the roof is fastened, is there a dimensional change on perimeter for the trim? Will any changes be made to dimensions for the trim line? Home owner stated no changes would be made.</p> <p>See attached narrative</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: David & Carmen Quinn

(Abner and Jones c1857)

Property Address: 419 College Street, Oxford NC 27565
 Sworn stakeholders: David Quinn
 Property type: Residential/Contributing
 Project type: Wood Trim and Canvas replacement
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: Yes, David Quinn, HPC Member

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
<p>The property owner is requesting COA approval to</p> <p>1. Replace wood trim at roof line installed in 2005 same pattern that is white interior pine trim with white plastic, same pattern painted white.</p> <p>Trim discussion: Mr. Quinn stated the kitchen wing went through a remodel in 2014-2015 and trim is part of the remodel. This is not part of original house and he wanted to ensure it was clear what he wanted to use and if the direction requested is that he use pine, and not compost, he will go with pine. Commission asked for clarification that part of house is an addition and not part of the historical part of home.</p> <p>2. Install canvas awning over back entrance to basement. Metal frame and canvas proposed. Previously approved by OHC but in Canvas.</p> <p>Item #2 was previously approved by the HPC but the company can't install the awning in the timeframe of 60 days. The Commission suggested that he wait until he is ready to start and get it approved as a minor works. There is no change but just put off by the contractors.</p>	Height of proposed Structure	2.	<p>1. Tony Armento made a motion that the COA should be congruent with the Design Guidelines 1.200 (subparagraph 2), 2.104, 2.105 and 2.106 so therefore should be approved.</p> <p>It was seconded by Lisa Schons</p> <p>The HPC voted unanimously to approve.</p> <p>2. Will submit as a minor works when ready to start work.</p>
	Setback/placement of structure		
	Exterior Construction Materials		
	Exterior Colors		
	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C	
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		
	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C	
	Appurtenant fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		
	Trees	2.C	

- * 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: Jeff and Lisa Schons

(Colonel Rogers OGregory House c1800's)

Property Address: 414 College Street, Oxford NC 27565
 Sworn stakeholders: Lisa Schons
 Property type: Residential/Contributing
 Project type: Restore front door and replace glass; replace rusty chimney caps
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: Yes, Lisa Schons

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
<p>The property owner is requesting COA approval to</p> <p>1. Restore front door with stained wood, with same stain. Replace glass from Patterned Glass to Frosted Glass.</p> <p>Lisa stated that the current glass in the door is not original to the door. The glass that is currently in the door has been replaced over time. The example given was a photo of the glass over the door and that glass is original to the home. The door person stated the glass would have originally been frosted so she is requesting to replace glass with frosted glass.</p> <p>2. Stained wood and</p> <p>3. Replace rusted chimney caps</p> <p>The Commission stated she should submit a minor works for the chimney cap replacement and the door restain since the stain will remain the same.</p>	Height of proposed Structure	2.	<p>1. Mike Delionbach made a motion that the COA should be congruent with the Design Guidelines 6.104 so therefore should be approved.</p> <p>It was seconded by Tony Armento.</p> <p>The HPC voted unanimously to approve.</p>
	Setback/placement of structure		
	Exterior Construction Materials		
	Exterior Colors		
	Architectural Details	1.C 2.C	
	Roof (shape/form/materials)		
	Doors/Windows/Fenestrations		
	General form and proportion	1.C 2.C	
	Appurtenant fixtures		
	Structural Conditions		
Trees	2.C		

* 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 Works: There were none of these since the last meeting.

COA Renewal: There were none of these since the last meeting.

Demolition by Neglect: There are none at this time.

New Business

Topic	Discussion	Outcome
<p>2020 Historic Preservation Fund Grants for Certified Local Government</p>	<p>Tony provided an overview of how this grant was originally put in place. He stated about 5 years ago, the Commission did an update of the architectural survey. Tony contacted State Office and found out was 30 years long enough. The survey was due for an update at that point. The State Office sent someone to look around Oxford. Claudia Brown looked and saw expansion areas. The commission went forward and needed the City to agree since they were responsible for 40% of the cost. The Commission met with the Board of Commissioners. The BOC supported this and the Commission completed the application for state funding. The Commission was awarded the grant and it took about a year for the survey to be updated and completed. The next step of project was to turn the survey into an application to the park service. The Commission was fortunate that at that time, an anonymous donor donated the 11k to fund the entire thing. At that point, the Commission did not need city or state office funding. This process finished about a year ago, around the fall of 2019. The Commission was waiting for them to review and decide what will now be sent to the national park service. It has been long and arduous. The Commission is at</p>	<p><i>2020 Historic Preservation Fund Grants for Certified Local Government: Derreck will reach out to Cheryl to review comments. If anyone has questions, please let Derreck know. Comments in the mailing</i></p> <p><i>Cheryl will make sure the Mayor has a copy and she will drop a copy off at Derreck's door. Derreck will reach out to Tony for assistance.</i></p>

the place now that the final document will be submitted for registered listing is finished. The commission has a couple steps to take.

1. The Commission needs to reply to the comments from City of Oxford. This was never heard of since the State Office has reviewed everything.
2. The commission is required to hold a public meeting so any affected property owners are aware their home may become listed in the National Historic Register of Historic Places and what that means.

After those two steps are completed, the district is expanded. The OHC is different from the two local preservation districts. City of Oxford does not share the same footprint. OHC is federal listed and has nothing to do with the HPC commission. It is an honoraria situation that keeps highways from coming through our homes and gives homeowners tax credits. It does not have anything to do with the Commission in our roles as advocates for preservation. The commission will not review the projects unless they fall under the local designation. The area of Military and Williamsboro Streets were a big part left out of the process which is East Military Street and turning onto North Williamsboro Street. This area would have been contiguous with the expansion area but with all the demolition and continuous construction that occurred during the 20th century, that whole area was left out. The Commission has made an application to the state since this area is part of the survey, it is eligible to go through the expansion. Unfortunately, there is no private donor and the Commission needs the City to pay. This was approved and is under way and at the middle point in the process where the other one is about finished. This also includes more areas of town but we haven't advanced to applications to the park service. An example was Green Acres was on the study list with the State office. There are a couple of individual buildings and the Masonic home for children is on it. Those can be move forward to an application in the future. It is important to deal with the the Williamsboro/Military street area as it had been cut off from

Next meeting is September 17, 2020 and plan to make the notice at that meeting.

Additional Comment regarding application fees	the OHD expansions. They can be moved forward to national registry status if anyone is interested in doing it since they have gone through that first stage.	
Facebook App Update	<p>There was additional discussion regarding COA fees. Fees for defensible expense with in the city or the commission side, justifies a fee. It needs to be a defensible expense of some kind. It was discussed that some kind of fee should be associated if it cost the commission any funds. There is overhead the city would like to recover but there is no support for that. It was noted that in some historic areas, application fees are high. The Commission stated they felt it would discourage participation in the process to follow other towns and ask for a fee with the application. The Commission suggested only considering a fee if it is a defensible cost, ie., COA submission after the project has begun.</p> <p>Lisa provided an update regarding the Facebook app information that is not up to date to match the HPC website. She has been working on the issue but has no resolution to date. Derreck offered to submit a service note to Apple and see if anyone else is having the same issue with hopes to obtain a way to correct this issue. Lisa asked Derreck to send the info to her so that she can ask.</p>	

Derreck will send apple information to Lisa.

Motion to Adjourn	1st	2nd	Outcome
	David Quinn	Lisa Schons	The HPC adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Date of Next Meeting: September 17, 2020

Minutes Prepared by: Lou Ann Mitchell