

## OXFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

### MINUTES

**JUNE 6, 2011**

The regular meeting of the Oxford Historic District Commission was called to order by the chairman, William Dial, on Monday, June 6, 2011, at 5:00 p.m., in the meeting room of the Oxford Community Services Building.

Other commission members in attendance were Thomas Costigan, James Deerin, Jennifer Stanley, and Dorothy Fenwick.

The minutes of the meeting of May 2, 2011 were approved and accepted as distributed.

The following permits were reviewed by the commission:

1. Permit #11-29, Steven Clyburn and Arlene Bickel, 200 N. Morris Street, replacement of four damaged windows at rear of property with custom Anderson Woodwright double hung, series 400, six over six, prefinished white on the interior. Mr. Clyburn explained to the commission that he and his wife would like to replace some windows on the second floor in the back of their home. He provided the commission with photos showing the street views. Mr. Dial asked if the windows could be seen from Factory Street. Mr. Clyburn replied that he guessed they could but that the windows were cheap ones installed around 1978. A motion was made by Mrs. Stanley to accept the application as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Costigan and unanimously carried with all in favor.

2. Permit #11-26, John Kendall, 307 S. Morris Street, construct new 12' x 16' shed to replace old 10' x 36' shed. Mr. Kendall was represented by Mary Crabb from the building firm of Crabb and Company. Mrs. Crabb reminded the commission that Mr. Kendall had received permission at the last month's meeting to take down his previously existing shed which was falling down. He would now like to replace that shed with a new shed smaller in size. Mrs. Crabb explained that there is a large tree to the front of where the old shed was and if the owner was to push the shed further towards S. Morris Street, it would damage the tree. As such, Mr. Kendall was trying to keep the shed off the tree but in the same general area as the old shed. The owner wishes to install a simple shed. Mrs. Crabb presented 3 options for the new shed – the only difference with the 3 options was with the windows. Mrs. Crabb stated that Mr. Kendall would like a window on the rear elevation with shutters and sliding doors on the side. His preference would be not to have windows on the front of the shop. All 3 options have a sliding door. A slab would be installed on the grade and the shed would be raised up just a bit with a brick foundation to match the foundation of the house. Mrs. Fenwick asked who would be able to see the shed. Mrs. Crabb responded that Mr. Kendall would be able to see it from his property next door and also neighbors Jennifer Stanley and James Deerin, if they were standing on the edge of their yards. The siding covering the shed would be hardi-plank. Mrs. Crabb noted that Mr. Kendall preferred Option A that shows a shed without a window facing the street. She noted that Option B has a little front window and Option C has a bigger front window. Mrs. Crabb added that the owner worried that Plan C would show too much of what

he had inside the shed and would give him one less wall to work with. A motion was made by Ms. Litty to accept Plan A of the applicant's plans. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Stanley and unanimously carried with all in favor.

3. Permit # 11-31, John and Madeleine Yates, 228 South St., two story addition, second story over existing demo of roof and 1 ½ story, gravel patio, relocate window, restore Merrill windows, remove gravel drive and replace with new tire track driveway. Mr. and Mrs. Yates were represented by their architect, Christine Dayton. Ms. Dayton explained to the commission that an addition to the Yates' house, in the same location, had been approved by the HDC when the previous owners, the Renners, had this house. Ms. Dayton stated that the new owners were proposing to put on an addition towards the side facing the church at 225 S. Morris Street. The difference between this addition and the one approved in the past is that the older one had a small one story projection. The Yates would like to have a two story addition. The owners also want to totally refurbish the existing windows in the front of the house. The addition would have Marvin clad double hung windows to replicate the number of lights but they would not be the same as the windows in the original part of the home. Ms. Dayton further noted that the siding they would like to use is called new cedar, which is a PVC product which would replicate the existing siding. The existing house has simple trim which would be replicated on the addition. The new siding has some standard colors, which are all Sherwin-William colors, so that the entire house would be the same color. Mr. Dial made a notation on the application that the owner would be carrying the exterior colors throughout the building. Mrs. Fenwick asked what the increase to the house would be. Ms. Dayton responded that the first floor would be 201 sq. ft. and the second floor would have 309 sq. ft. Mr. Dial referred to a letter for Town Administrator, Lillian Lord, dated 5/6/11 acknowledging that a variance to this house was granted in 2004 and that it remain in effect. The variance is for the setbacks on the church side of the property. Mrs. Fenwick asked about the siding that is currently on the home. Ms. Dayton responded that the house currently had wood cedar box siding. The owners will maintain the cedar on the original portion of the cottage but because they are planning to come out on the side and back of the house, a different material will be used there. Mr. Dial made a notation on the application that the new siding will have a 5" exposure and that the existing siding has a 4 ½ to 5 inch exposure. Mr. Costigan stated that he noticed the plans show no use of shutters and questioned whether this was an oversight or if it was by design. Ms. Dayton responded that it was just an oversight and that the owners were planning on having shutters. Mr. Deerin asked if there would be shutters on two windows located on the side of the house. Ms. Dayton responded that it would not because it wouldn't make sense proportionally and with pairing the windows it is typically not architecturally feasible as one wants the shutter to be the same proportion as the windows. Mr. Dial pointed out that the plans call for a skylight in the back. Ms. Dayton noted that it was a "sun tunnel" that would not be visible from the street as it would be flat and on the backside of the house. She added that the advantage of a sun tunnel is that it has a reflective tube on the inside so that is not a shaft. The tube can be flexed to the surface of the ceiling resulting in getting light in the space it is needed without being seen from the outside roof. The purpose of the sun tunnel is to get light to the bathroom stairs. Mr. Deerin stated that the addition on the streetside looked a little odd to him with regards to two windows which he felt looked lonely. Ms. Dayton explained that the reason for those

windows was that there was a staircase in that area. The stairs start at the bottom and come up and ending up at the existing landing in the house. She noted that it was not uncommon in architecture to express where a staircase is by having stepping windows that go up and that that section would be stepped back. Mr. Deerin asked if the gingerbread would remain at the peak. Ms. Dayton responded that it would and that the shingle would match the existing shingles on the roof. Mrs. Stanley made a motion to accept the plans as proposed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Deerin and unanimously carried without further discussion.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Willoughby  
Assistant Clerk