

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Be it remembered that the Oxford Historic Preservation Commission did meet in regular session on Tuesday, June 8, 2010 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Hall courtroom with the following members present:

Jeff Asti, Chairman
Campbell Best
Kevin Frye
Jack McKenzie
Harry Owens
Molissia Swaney
Sonia Weinburg Thompson

Katrina Hourin, Assistant City Planner
Tiffany Smith, Historic Preservation Consultant
Alicia Thompson, Secretary

The following Commissioners were absent:

Julie K. Spears
Shawn Telford

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Asti.

After the meeting was called to order, the following business was transacted:

Approval of the Agenda

Chairman Asti asked if there were any changes to the agenda.

There being no changes to the agenda, motion was made by Commissioner McKenzie and seconded by Commissioner Best to approve the amended agenda.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved and the agenda was accepted.

Approval of the Minutes from the May 11, 2010 Meeting

Chairman Asti asked if there were any modifications to the minutes from the May 11, 2010 meeting. The following changes were made to the minutes: Commissioner Owens stated that on Page 4 Public Hearing for Case #107 the address should be corrected from 814 Lincoln to 1604 Buchanan. Historic Preservation Consultant Tiffany Smith stated that corrections should be made to Page 5 indicating that public comments came from Santos Arico.

There being no further changes motion was made by Commissioner Best and seconded by Commissioner Thompson to approve the amended minutes from the May 11, 2010 meeting.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved.

Chairman Asti welcomed new Commissioner Babs Ton to the Commission.

REGULAR AGENDA

Public Hearing for Case #109 – 1339 Pierce Avenue. George Haymans came before the Commission seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness to modify a previously approved plan for 1339 Pierce Avenue. Mr. Haymans informed the Commission that the modification would include changing the previously approved roofline due to water drainage issues and changing the previously approved brick slurry to Hardiboard siding. Mr. Haymans presented the Commission with an elevation depicting the proposed new hip roof line. He stated that change was needed because the previously approved roof's pitch would not allow for a gutter system to be installed. Mr. Haymans then discussed the height of the proposed new hip roof line. Discussion was made regarding the proposed new roof hip roof line. Mr. Haymans also informed the Commission that he was seeking to apply Hardiboard siding rather than the previously approved brick slurry coat to the structure. Discussion was made regarding the applicant's request.

There being no questions or comments from the public or the Commission, motion was made by Commissioner Swaney and seconded by Commissioner McKenzie to approve the request for Certificate of Appropriateness to modify a previously approved plan for 1339 Pierce Avenue.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved.

Public Hearing for Case #110 – 912 University Avenue. David Bell came before the Commission representing Ed and Molly Meisenheimer seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove an existing wooden fence that is in disrepair and install a new wooden fence in its place. Mr. Bell also informed the Commission that the applicants were seeking to extend the proposed wooden fence to two other sides of the property. Mr. Bell presented the Commission with photos of the existing fence, a survey plat, and a rendering of the proposed new fence. Mr. Bell also informed the Commission that the applicants' neighbors supported the project. Discussion was made between Mr. Bell and the Commission regarding the applicants' request.

There being no questions or comments from the public or the Commission, motion was made by Commissioner McKenzie and seconded by Commissioner Thompson to approve the request for Certificate of Appropriateness for 912 University Avenue.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved.

Public Hearing for Case #111 – 919 Buchanan Avenue. Macel Juergens came before the Commission representing Ben Walker seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness to finish the installation of an existing fence in the rear yard of property located at 919 Buchanan Avenue. Ms. Juergens presented the Commission with photos of the existing fence and a site layout for the proposed fence. Ms. Juergens explained that the applicant had been previously granted a permit to install the fence, but the permit had expired before the fence was completed. Ms. Juergens informed the Commission that the applicant was proposing to install twenty-one (21) feet of fencing to complete the project. She also added that the applicant would be using the same materials as the existing fence. Discussion was made regarding the applicant's request.

There being no questions from the public or the Commission, motion was made by Commissioner McKenzie and seconded by Commissioner Thompson to approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to finish the installation of an existing fence in the rear yard of property located at 919 Buchanan Avenue.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved.

Public Hearing for Case #113 – 712 South Lamar Boulevard. *(Prior to the hearing Commissioner Best recused himself.)* Corey Alger of Alger Design Studio came before the Commission representing Jane and Wyburn Callicutt seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a front porch on property located at 712 South Lamar Boulevard. Mr. Alger presented the Commission with a site plan; elevations, and two alternating schemes for the proposed front porch. Mr. Alger explained to the Commission that Scheme #1 consisted of a gabled roof line and Scheme #2 consisted of a flat roof line for the proposed porch. Mr. Alger informed the Commission that the applicant preferred Scheme #2 which would be a less massive approach and more in keeping with the neighborhood. Discussion was made regarding the request. Mr. Alger also informed the Commission that the applicants were seeking a modest porch addition. Further discussion was made regarding the request.

There being no questions or comments from the public or the Commission, motion was made by Commissioner Owens and seconded by Commissioner Swaney to approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a front porch as presented in Scheme #2 on property located at 712 South Lamar Boulevard.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved.

Public Hearing for Case 112 – 1002 South 16th Street. Barry Grantham came before the Commission seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the windows and front door and repair the side deck on property located at 1002 South 16th Street. Mr. Grantham presented the Commission with photos of the existing structure, photos of neighboring structures, photos of the proposed replacement windows, and a scope of work. Mr. Grantham explained to the

Commission he was proposing to remove the existing aluminum windows and replace them with a more energy efficient Timeline Vinyl Windows. He also explained that the existing windows were a 2 light over 2 light configuration and that the proposed replacement windows were 6 light over 6 light Colonial light pattern. Mr. Grantham further explained that he was proposing to replace the existing front door with a 4 light over 2 light panel door. He also explained that he was desirous of replacing the existing deck for safety reasons and to conform to the building code. Mr. Grantham informed the Commission that the proposed new deck would be the exact same footprint as the current one. Discussion was made regarding the applicant's request.

There being no questions or comments from the public or the Commission, motion was made by Commissioner Swaney and seconded by Commissioner McKenzie to approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the windows and front door and repair the side deck on property located at 1002 South 16th Street.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved.

Public Hearing for Case 114 – 410 South 9th Street. Corey Alger of the Alger Design Studio came before the Commission representing Todd Bertolet seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness to make exterior renovations and construct a new addition on to property located at 410 South 9th Street. Mr. Alger presented the Commission with a site plan, photos of the existing structure, color photo renderings of the proposed renovation and addition and photos of the neighboring churches. Mr. Alger explained that the existing north oriented structure would remain intact, but the significant change would be to the structure's main entrance. Mr. Alger explained that the applicant was proposing to redirect the entrance from South 9th Street to Tyler Avenue. Mr. Alger further explained that the applicant was seeking to redirect the entrance due safety reasons because the applicant's have a small child. Discussion was made regarding the redirected entrance. Mr. Alger also explained that the shifted entrance would allow for New Orleans style courtyard. He presented photos of the proposed courtyard. Chairman Asti referenced diagram C 1.0 and stated that the fence depicted on diagram C 1.0 was not depicted on any of the photo renderings. Chairman Asti also asked Mr. Alger why he was proposing a fence in the front of home and around the Deodar Cedar. Chairman Asti referenced the City of Oxford Design Guidelines regarding fences and explained that the Commission had no idea what the proposed fence looked like and why a fence is being proposed on 9th Street when no other fences exist along 9th Street. Debate was made between Mr. Alger and Chairman Asti regarding the fence. Chairman Asti stated that in his opinion the proposed fence would expand the footprint of the property making the setback appear to be street to street. Lengthy debate was made between Chairman Asti and Mr. Alger regarding the setbacks and the footprint of the house. Chairman Asti expressed concern that the proposed fence was altering the aesthetic view of the property. Further discussion was made regarding the proposed fence.

Chairman Asti also referenced the color photo renderings and stated that the brick for the proposed project appeared to be painted. Chairman Asti asked Mr. Alger about the reason for the painted brick. Mr. Alger explained that the brick would be painted so that the proposed addition would match the existing structure. Chairman Asti expressed his opposition to painted

brick in a Historic District. Chairman Asti then stated that the color of the brick appeared to be a light color. Chairman Asti stated that the light color of the painted brick alters the historical feel of the structure. Lengthy debate was made regarding the proposed painted brick. Commissioner Swaney expressed concern that the proposed project resembled a new house rather than an old house. Commissioner Swaney further stated that the goal of the Commission is to make structures look like they have always been there. Debate was made between Mr. Alger and Commissioner Swaney regarding the proposed project.

Commissioner Owens expressed concern that the framed niche with the oriental statute on the Tyler Avenue side had disappeared. Commissioner Owens stated that the proposed project would destroy the current framed niche. Commissioner Owens further added that a significant portion of the existing structure would change with the proposed project. Debate was made between Mr. Alger and Commissioner Owens regarding the proposed project.

Mr. Alger expressed that he disagreed with the Commission and stated that the applicant was only proposing a modest transformation.

Chairman Asti provided the following comments objecting to the proposed project:

1. The proposed fence does not appear to be appropriate;
2. The proposed windows appear to have been altered to match the proposed fence;
3. Property appears to have been brought closer to the street;
4. A larger footprint appears to have been created with the higher fence;
5. Proposed project alters the roofline along Tyler Avenue;
6. Painted brick; and
7. One story building addition.

Mr. Asti stated that the proposed renovation was not appropriate for the structure. At this point during the meeting, Mr. Alger discussed the proposed project's elevations. Further lengthy debate was made between Mr. Alger and Chairman Asti regarding the proposed project's elevations and proposed courtyard. Mr. Alger then asked the Commission if he could return to the next meeting with a different rendering. Several Commissioners expressed their opposition to the proposed project citing the substantial transformation of the structure and proposed fence as their reasons. Further discussion was made regarding the proposed project.

There being no further questions or comments from the public or the Commission, motion was made by Commissioner Asti and seconded by Commissioner Swaney to convert the application from a Certificate of Appropriateness to a Complimentary Review for Case #114.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, motion was made by Commissioner McKenzie and seconded by Commissioner Thompson to adjourn the meeting.