

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Be it remembered that the Oxford Historic Preservation Commission did meet in regular session on Thursday, January 13, 2011 at 5:45 p.m. in the City Hall courtroom with the following members present:

Jack McKenzie, Vice Chairman
Campbell Best
Julie Spears
Molissia Swaney
Sonia Weinburg Thompson
Babs Ton

Tim Akers, City Planner
Alicia Thompson, Secretary

The following Commissioners were absent:

Jeff Asti
Harry Owens
Shawn Telford

The following staff member was absent:

Katrina Hourin, Assistant City Planner

1. The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman Jack McKenzie.

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

2. **Approval of the Agenda.** Vice Chairman McKenzie asked if there were any changes to the agenda. The following change was made to the agenda: the addition of Item #7 – Complimentary Review for property located at 1209 South 16th Street (Magnolia Place). There being no further changes to the agenda, motion was made by Commissioner Swaney and seconded by Commissioner Best to approve the amended agenda.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved and the agenda was accepted.

3. **Approval of the Minutes from the December 14, 2010 Meeting.** Vice Chairman McKenzie asked if there were any modifications to the minutes from the December 14, 2010 meeting. There being no changes, motion was made by Commissioner Best and seconded by Commissioner Swaney to approve the minutes from the December 14, 2010 meeting.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

4. **Public Hearing for Case #117 – Initiation of Demolition by Neglect Procedure for property located at 1405 Madison Avenue.** Charles Calhoun along with his contractor, Wrenn Greene returned to the Commission regarding the findings of the condition of property located at 1405 Madison Avenue. Mr. Calhoun provided the Commission with an estimate to demolish the front porch of the property and stated that he was proposing to remove the porch because he could not afford the costs to repair it. Vice Chairman cautioned the applicant that the Commission could not approve a request to demolish the porch without a plan to replace it. Mr. Calhoun stated that the condition of the porch was poor and costs to replace it were not within his budget. Mr. Calhoun further stated that the estimate he received from Wrenn Greene only outlined the cost to demolish the porch.

Commissioner Swaney asked Mr. Calhoun if there was any way he could repair the porch to prevent it from further deterioration. Commissioner Best also asked Mr. Calhoun if he had prepared a scope of work for the remaining repairs to the property. Mr. Calhoun replied that currently no one was residing in the home and that he could not financially afford to make repairs to the property at this time. Mr. Greene explained to the Commission that in his opinion the porch was installed some time after the original home was constructed, but he was not sure of the date. Mr. Greene also stated that the roofline of the porch appeared to be separate from that of the original structure and that in his opinion the porch was beyond repair. Mr. Greene further stated that in his opinion the porch was unsafe and the only option was to remove it. Mr. Greene also informed the Commission that the roof was in poor condition and that a replacement roof would need to be installed as soon as possible to prevent further damage to the structure. Mr. Calhoun also stated that he has had repairs previously done on the home, but he later found out that the repairs were made with untreated wood which has lead to further deterioration of the structure.

Commissioner Spears commented that removal of the porch would drastically alter the home's character. Mr. Calhoun rebutted by saying that removal of the porch should not alter the home's character since it was not original to the structure. Commissioner Spears then asked Mr. Calhoun if he could repair the porch enough to prevent it from any further deterioration. Mr. Greene then informed the Commission that the condition of the porch was very poor. Mr. Greene stated that the porch was rotten and unsafe and that pieces of the porch might be salvageable, but the porch unit as a whole was unsalvageable. Mr. Calhoun stated that costs to repair the porch were higher than the cost to remove the porch and that he did not currently have the funds in his budget to repair or replace the porch. Commissioner Swaney asked Mr. Calhoun if he had any future plans to replace the porch if it were demolished. Mr. Calhoun discussed the possibility of adding the porch back at a later time if it were to be demolished. Commissioner Ton asked Mr. Calhoun if had any plans to move back into the home at a later date. Mr. Calhoun replied that at some point he would like to move back into the home if he can secure funding and make the necessary repairs. Commissioner Swaney asked Mr. Calhoun if he had any future plans for the front entrance if the porch was removed. Mr. Greene stated that one option would to be adding brick steps to

the front entrance if the porch was removed. Mr. Greene also stated that another option would be to add a stoop over the front entrance if the porch was removed but that he and Mr. Calhoun had not made any definite plans for the front entrance. Commissioner Spears advised Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Greene to include an option to protect the front entrance in the event the porch is removed in the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Vice Chairman McKenzie also advised the applicant to consider installing gutters to prevent the front entrance from rotting if the porch were removed.

Further discussion was made regarding the removal of the porch and Vice Chairman McKenzie further advised Mr. Calhoun that the Commission would need plans detailing the specifics on how he would repair or replace the porch and plans to repair the deteriorating structure. Vice Chairman McKenzie then further informed Mr. Calhoun that the Commission could not approve anything without a specific plan for the property. Mr. Greene informed Vice Chairman McKenzie that he did not have plans because he had only come before the Commission to answer questions about the condition of the property at the request of Assistant City Planner Katrina Hourin.

Commissioner Swaney stated that the goal was to keep the home from further deterioration and asked Mr. Calhoun if he could afford to make repairs to the home in stages. Vice Chairman McKenzie asked Mr. Calhoun if something could be done to temporarily support the porch and install a roof on it. Discussion was made between Mr. Calhoun and the Commission about repairing the home in the stages and supporting the porch temporarily. After discussion, Mr. Calhoun asked if the Commission would grant him permission to install a new roof on the home and complete the other repairs at a later time. Further discussion was made about installing a new roof on the structure and Mr. Calhoun was informed that he would need to provide the Commission with plans detailing the specifics to repair or replace the porch as well as plans to repair the deteriorating structure.

There being no further questions or comments from the public or the Commission, motion was made by Commissioner Ton and seconded by Commissioner Best to grant Mr. Calhoun permission to install a new roof as routine maintenance on property located at 1405 Madison Avenue.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved.

Vice Chairman McKenzie again advised Mr. Calhoun to provide the Commission with plans detailing the specifics to repair or replace the porch as well as plans to repair the deteriorating structure along with his application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Vice Chairman McKenzie also advised Mr. Calhoun to present the Commission with a photo of the home minus the porch in his application.

Commissioner Spears informed Mr. Calhoun that the roof would need to be replaced using the same types of materials as the existing roof. Commissioner Spears also advised Mr. Calhoun to document the condition of the porch with photographs and measurements in the event the porch suffered further deterioration before it can be repaired or replaced.

Commissioner Spears also suggested that Mr. Calhoun consider installing some type of protection for the front entrance if approval is granted to remove the porch. Vice Chairman McKenzie informed Mr. Calhoun that he would need to apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness and return to the Commission with plans before commencing any of the additional repairs.

5. **Public Hearing for Case #128 – 433 North 14th Street.** Larry Overstreet came before the Commission representing Overstreet Properties seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness to install railings onto a porch located at 433 North 14th Street. Mr. Overstreet informed the Commission that his insurance company had done an inspection of the property and informed his company that hand rails of at least 42 inches tall with vertical balusters with no more than four inch spacing needed to be installed on the front porch steps of the property for insurance purposes. Mr. Overstreet stated that needing to comply as soon as possible for insurance purposes; he inadvertently had the hand rails installed without realizing he needed the Commission's approval. Mr. Overstreet presented the Commission with photos of the porch and installed wooden hand rails and asked for permission to allow the wooden hand rails to remain in place. After reviewing the photos, Commissioner Swaney asked Mr. Overstreet why the hand rails were installed in the middle of the steps rather than along the sides. Discussion was made regarding the placement of the hand rails. Discussion was also made regarding other styles of hand rails that could be placed on the porch. Commissioner Spears suggested that Mr. Overstreet install metal type hand rails spaced further apart vertically than the current wooden handrails.

Public comments came from Peggy Supple who agreed with the Commission that the railings should be spaced further apart vertically. Commissioner Swaney also added that Mr. Overstreet's properties are always well maintained and beautifully kept and stated that a different type of hand rail than the one installed would add to the character of the home. Commissioner Best agreed with Commissioner Swaney and suggested that Mr. Overstreet inform his insurance company that the home is located within a Historic District. After further discussion, the Commission informed Overstreet to revisit other styles of handrails to be installed on the porch and return to the Commission at a later date.

Mr. Overstreet agreed and no action was taken.

6. **Public Hearing for Case #129 – 1424 South 10th Street.** Tim Akers came before the Commission representing Mike and Katrina Hourin seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a retaining wall on property located at 1424 South 10th Street. Mr. Akers presented the Commission with photos of the property and the proposed retaining wall. Mr. Akers informed the Commission that the applicants were proposing to construct a stacked field stone retaining wall no higher than 18 – 24 inches in height. Mr. Akers also stated that the proposed retaining wall would run the length of the existing flower beds. Discussion was made regarding the applicants' request.

There being no further questions or comments from the public or the Commission, motion was made by Commissioner Swaney and seconded by Commissioner Best to approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a field stone retaining wall for property located at 1424 South 10th Street.

All present voting aye.

The motion was approved.

7. **Complimentary Review for property located at 1209 South 16th Street.** Edye Conkerton of ECO Architects came before the Commission seeking complimentary review for Elevation #C for property located at 1209 South 16th Street. Ms. Conkerton stated that the Commission had previously approved the design of Elevations #A, #B, & #D and that she was seeking feedback for Elevation #C. Discussion was made regarding Elevation #C and the Commission provided Ms. Conkerton with positive feedback. Commissioners Spears and Swaney commented that the elevation was much improved over the one previously presented. There were no further comments.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned.