

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes March 18, 2021

Call to Order	In Attendance	Absent	Guests
<p>Made by: Derreck Brown</p> <p>Time: 6:02p.m.</p>	<p>Derreck Brown-Chairman Tony Armento – Vice Chairman Lisa Schons-Secretary David Quinn - Member Kelly Collins-Schram -member Mike Delionbach - Member Cheryl Hart-Planning Director Dickon Housman-Member</p> <p>** Ethics Statements read by: Derreck Brown</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dan Gordon, COA Application 2. Braxton Henderson, COA Application 3. Allen & Cameron Winston, COA Application

Treasury Report	Starting Balance		Expenditures since last meeting	Current Balance
	\$1490.00 \$320.00 set aside for medallion \$432.00 for recording secretary until June. \$389.00* (*Special Purpose Contest fund can be carried year to year) No disbursements since August		\$85.00 – recording secretary fee	\$432.00 for remainder of the year
Approval of Minutes	Date of Minutes	Motion to Approve	2nd	Outcome
	2/18/2021	Tony Armento	David Quinn	Approved with suggested changes

Summary of Approved Minor Works: 110 High Street. Replacing rotting siding with same material and same color, the COA submission was reviewed and approved for minor works.

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

COA APPLICATION REVIEW #1: Don Gordon

White Britt House c. 1180

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 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>	Height of proposed Structure		<p>1. Tony Armento made a motion that the COA is not congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 13.102 and should therefore be deferred to the April 15 meeting when more information can be provided to the commission. It was seconded by David Quinn. 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: Braxton M. Henderson

Dr. GS Watkins House c.1919

Property Address: 316 Main Street, Oxford NC 27565
 Sworn stakeholders: Braxton Henderson
 Property type: Contributing Residential
 Project type: Replace damaged and leaky standing seam on metal roof
 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 and leaky standing seam terne metal roof with new standing seam aluminum/zinc metal roof.</p> <p><i>Homeowner narrative:</i></p> <p>We are looking to replace the damaged terne metal roofing with a new 26 Gauge Horizon-Loc standing seam metal roof. This roof will be matte black in color, consistent with the previous roof. The crimping of the seams on the original roof is unable to be replicated due to these materials and techniques being out-of-date. However, the Horizon-Loc roof will have concealed fasteners and will maintain the same slope, pitch, and exterior details of old. The original roof has been in place for over 100 years and has undergone many repairs prior to us purchasing the home. After several failed repairs on our end, per the recommendation of our roofing contractor (Cruz Roofing, Henderson, NC) we have decided to proceed with replacement. Whenever it rains, the roof continues to produce leaks in our laundry room, our kids' playroom, as well as our front porch and has done so for the 2 years that we have owned the home. The contractor has temporarily placed a tarp and sealer over the compromised areas as an emergent measure.</p> <p>40 minute delay from tornado warning. Mr. Henderson was sworn in and presented prior to the delay. After the delay, Mr. Henderson continued but Ms. Henderson also joined the call. The Henderson's stated that they felt the HPC was not</p>	Height of proposed Structure		<p>1. Mike Delionbach made a motion that the COA is not congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 5.100, 5.104, 5.105 and 5.203 and should therefore not be approved.</p> <p>It was seconded by Dickon Housman.</p> <p>Tony Armento did not vote.</p> <p>The HPC voted to deny.</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				

supportive of them fixing their home and that the approach by the HPC appears to be contrary to supporting property owners. It was stated by the Chair that the HPC is not against any homeowner; instead, we can only take the information provided in the request, along with any evidence provided by the applicant, to determine its conformity to the Design Guidelines. If it does not align with specific language in the Design Guidelines, we cannot create new guidelines. Also, if roofing was installed prior to the inception of the HPC, we cannot take into account as a mitigating circumstance which would allow the same roofing to be placed on another house.

* 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: Allen & Cameron Winston Meadows House c. 1911

Property Address: 611 College Street, Oxford NC 27565
 Sworn stakeholders: Allen Winston
 Property type: Contributing Residential
 Project type: Replace tin shingles
 HPC Conflicts of Interest declared: None

Project Description	Factors Considered *	**	Outcome
<p>The property owner is requesting COA approval to</p> <p>1. Replace dilapidated tin shingles from embossed tin shingle to standing seam shingles on non-flat portion of roof. Vendor removed incorrect part of roof and the back was removed as well. Confirmed it is embossed tin underneath and had samples that look like what is on the roof now. There is no lead time on when it can be received for the embossed tin. He does have access to standing seam. Standing seam is different but historically accurate for the period. Less than 20% of houses have historic roofing on them. Most are asphalt shingles. Motion bases of knowing whether we have a mitigating opportunity or not</p> <p>Rofer does not know when he can get the tin shingle based on lack of supply.</p> <p>Owner stated he sourced around and does not know when or if he can get the shingles. Stated</p>	Height of proposed Structure		<p>1. Tony Armento made a motion that the COA is not congruent with the Oxford Design Guidelines 5.104 (if original material is not available and has not been proven so therefore, substitute material can't not be used) should therefore not be approved. Motion based on knowing whether we have a mitigating opportunity or not.</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			

that the HPC is hard to work with. HPC's job is to follow the guidelines and not engage in disparate treatment. We can only look at the guidelines

Responsibility to preserve the look and feel of the buildings over the last 7 years we have approved more than 97% of those that have come before and we try to find ways to make it work in the Design Guidelines. Sometimes it doesn't fit and sometimes those applications carry urgency. This is not relevant on the facts provided. The HPC has to look at the Design Guidelines and make sure they are fairly applied to everyone. It is true that State level has much less requirements than Oxford's Design Guidelines. Their obligation is not our obligation. State is not trying to preserve the look and feel of our buildings. HPC asked the property owner how long would be the wait until materials can be received. Owner has asked since January when the materials can be received. Contractor does not know when it will be received.

Owner can go back and ask when the materials could be received. Property owner did state shingles he showed were exactly what is on the roof now. Gage may not be same, but style and stamp is identical.

It Dickon Housman was seconded by.

The HPC voted unanimously to deny.

The application is not supported by the guidelines. If it will take longer than 6-12 months to receive the correct material, then this could be reviewed as a mitigating factor.

HPC member suggested on East McClanahan Street there is a property that already ordered the materials. May have a different supply channel than property owner's roofer has.

If the property owner does reach out to contractor to determine the length of time to receive correct material, then the property owner can reach back out to the HPC to say how long it will be and put in writing to the HPC from the contractor stating how long it will take.

Property owner asked if they cannot use standing seam, what roofing material is acceptable. The HPC can tell you a preference metal for metal, or shape for shape, based only on what is within the Design Guidelines. Other materials could be considered a substitute depending on mitigating circumstance.

* 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

The Chair stated it's been a difficult night dealing with COA requests, along with the delays brought forth by the tornado warnings. Since he has been a member of the HPC, he has not dealt with that level of disappointment and frustration directed at the HPC. We have a responsibility, duty and oath to look at and review the Design Guidelines and make decisions based ONLY on the information provided in the COA application. It is sometimes difficult and painful. We all have homes in Oxford and we want our homes to stay beautiful and maintain the historical aspects of this great city. If we stay true and on point to the guidelines, and stay on course and treat everyone the same and do our job, we succeed. We did what we can do within the guidelines and sometimes it is just unfortunate that we cannot do more.

The HPC has a responsibility to hear each COA applicant. Although the HPC cannot take into account emotions and personal preference, or even statements regarding financial difficulties, etc., we do have a responsibility to comport ourselves with the utmost professionalism, regardless of whether or not an applicant does the same. COA applicants must provide detailed information when they present their case. This information should support what has been provided in the COA. If it is not within the guidelines, then the HPC has no alternative but to not approve the request. One thing that will be required moving forward is that each applicant will be heard if they need to convey concern or frustration. Even if this does not directly impact what was requested, or the HPC's final decision, each COA applicant has the right to be heard.

David made the suggestion to think about how to use the current situations to build into the application process to make expectations clearer and what the HPC needs for the application to be successful. We all want these conversations to go smoother and provide clarity and specifics of what we need to complete the task of reviewing and voting on a COA application. The Chair stated that would be very helpful. It is a balancing act. The Liaison's role is to make sure the baseline information is there in each application. She checks for the list, COA and photos, if needed. It was stated that other HPC's have someone who provides better data and makes sure the COA is in compliance. Unfortunately, Oxford does not have the resources to do this and our Liaison does a good job.

It was stated that the HPC cannot manage the emotions but can manage the data and perceptions of the data. This would go a long way with helping the Oxford community.

Motion to Adjourn	1st	2nd	Outcome
	David Quinn	Michael Delionbach	The HPC adjourned at 8:43p.m.

Date of Next Meeting: Thursday, April 15, 2021

Minutes Prepared by: Lou Ann Mitchell