HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION (HAPC)
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, July 13, 2022
6:15 P.M.

I. Call to Order

The July 13, 2022 meeting of the Oxford Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission was called to order at 6:15 p.m. by Chris Skoglind.

Those members present: Chris Skoglind, Alex French, Dana Miller, Brad Spurlock, Corey Watt
Those members excused: Hueston Kyger, Sean Wagner
Staff members present: Sam Perry, Community Development Director
Staff members excused: None

II. Approval of Agenda

<u>Mr. Watt made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. French seconded the motion.</u> All were in favor.

III. Public Comments

There were none.

IV. Approval of Minutes of April 13, 2022

<u>Mr. Watt made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Ms. French seconded the motion. Mr. Spurlock abstained from voting since he was not part of the Commission at that time. The motion was approved 4-0-1 (1 abstained).</u>

V. New Business

HAPC-2022-04, 10 North Beech Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, alteration to existing building alley façade, **Gregory Meyer, Architect/Agent**

Mr. Perry started his presentation by describing the location of the property. The location is known as the former Princess Theater. Mr. Perry noted that the Applicant provided drawings that shows the building elevations and they are part of the packet.

Mr. Perry provided slides for the Commission while explaining the proposed plan. Mr. Perry emphasized since there are going to be modifications made to the exterior an approved COA is a condition before a Building Permit can be obtained.

Mr. Skoglind wanted clarification on the awning whether it is permanent or retractable.

Mr. Meyer started his presentation by stating the proposal is to develop an indoor music venue. Mr. Meyer then explained that the existing aluminum/glass windows would be taken out and replaced with an upward operating aluminum/glass door system. Mr. Meyer added there would be a bar inside with a few seating options. Mr. Meyer further explained the owner's original thought was to install an awning that comes out 2-3 feet. Giving more thought to the awning, the owner decided a retractable awning would be a better choice because it could provide protection from various weather elements, it could be opened by sections, and it could be rolled up when it is not in use, explained Mr. Meyer. Mr. Meyer added the applicant is also proposing fencing between the outdoor seating area and the alley. The fence would match with the storefront and the overhead aluminum finish.

Mr. Skoglind noted that posts will be needed to install the awning. Mr. Meyer said that concrete slabs will be poured. Mr. Watt added this would increase lot coverage. Mr. Perry stated that lot coverage is not an issue in the Uptown Zoning District. However, the Commission could still make a decision of the appropriateness of the proposed plan even though there could be zoning issues to work through.

Mr. Watt was wondering about two things: (1) why the building was not built to the property line, (2) the fact that there are quite a bit of electric lines running in the alley. Mr. Meyer informed the Commission that they had discussions with Duke Electric about the power lines. Mr. Meyer explained that the building elevation is not out to the property line in the alley because of the electric lines. Mr. Meyer added there are patio areas both on the east and west sides and an electric pole had to be relocated being so close to the electric lines. Since the floor area ratio was maxed out, they could not bring the patio out to the property line explained Mr. Meyer.

Mr. Skoglind asked Mr. Meyer what Duke Energy thought about the proposed plan. Mr. Meyer stated that Duke Energy did not have a problem with the proximity of the proposed awning to the electric lines. Mr. Meyer said there is a 3 feet setback from the property line, and the canopy's length from the building would be 8'10". Mr. Meyer explained that a supervisor from Duke was at the site and found no problem with the proposed plan. Mr. Meyer added there is documentation of this.

Mr. Skoglind inquired whether the adjacent property owners have been informed about the proposed plan. Mr. Meyer did not believe that this was done.

Mr. Watt expressed his concerns about the awning, the concrete slabs, and the poles from a historic point of view. Another concern of Mr. Watt's was a quid pro quo because the research he did brought forth that what was agreed to by the applicant is not installed on the building. Because of this Mr. Watt is concerned whether this would happen again with this project. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Watt what the applicant was supposed to install. Mr. Watt said it was a marquee or something similar to that.

Mr. Skoglind inquired whether the applicant has any plans in regards to signage. Mr. Meyer said he asked the applicant if there was any conversations about who would do the sign, the owner or the proposed tenant.

Mr. Skoglind inquired about the egress doors. Mr. Meyer said there are two existing doors on the alley side of the building. One that leads to the mechanical room, and the other that is going to be an egress door to the proposed bar, which will match to the existing storefront doors. The second proposed overhead egress door would be the replacement of one of the existing storefront windows which is not going to be under the canopy.

Mr. Meyer next briefly touched on the landscape plan.

Mr. Watt commented on the railing and stated he wanted to see a solid, continuous railing perhaps with a gate as a means of egress. Mr. Skoglind shared Mr. Watt's point of view.

Mr. Watt restated his concerns about the canopy. Mr. Watt does not want to see that the canopy area would eventually turn into an extension of the building, such as a three-season room. Mr. Skoglind agreed with Mr. Watt. To prevent this, Mr. Skoglind added that if the proposal, the installation of the canopy and the half wall, garners the approval of the commission, anything beyond this have to come back to the commission to seek approval. The rest of the commission members agreed with Mr. Skoglind's on this matter.

Mr. Miller thought the project would be an enhancement to the alley.

Ms. French inquired if the commission did not approve the canopy and the railings, patio would the applicant still install the rolling bar doors/windows. Mr. Meyer was not sure what the applicant would do. Mr. Meyer thought the applicant might do the patio with some chairs and tables, and possibly provide a space for smokers. Mr. Skoglind added that without a concrete pad or something similar the area overtime would turn into a mud pit. Mr. Meyer agreed. Ms. French added that a canopy and railing would contribute to a nicer looking alley.

Mr. Watt believed that a barrier is a requirement for a patio for an establishment that serves alcohol. Mr. Spurlock agreed with other commission members that the project would dress up the alley. Mr. Spurlock however also shared Mr. Watt's concerns in regards to the canopy that it would be a permanent feature.

Ms. French wondered if this project was approved would other places want to have a canopy or something similar feature. Mr. Perry pointed out that Skipper's has a request for a pergola.

Mr. Skoglind opened up the opportunity for the public to comment on the agenda item.

Michael Smith, 6458 Contreras Rd
Mr. Smith was not in favor of the project. Mr. Smith stated that the owners were asked and agreed to put the historic marquee back on the building, but it did not happen. Mr. Smith communicated that he does not like how the alley looks behind the Brick Street bar which is owned by the applicant of this project. Mr. Smith also commented on the noise issue that the proposed bar could cause since there are residences around the site.

Ms. French was asking what she could do as a Council representative and as HAPC commission member. Mr. Perry pointed out that Ms. French as a council member could ask the City Manager to increase enforcement of noise since that area is weak. Mr. Skoglind joined the conversation and restated his earlier comment on encouraging the tenant and the owners of the building to have a conversation with the adjoining owners about the proposed plan.

Mr. Perry stated that noise from an establishment in HAPC review could not be a reason for denial by HAPC. Mr. Skoglind affirmed.

Mr. Perry mentioned that some communities require outdoor cafes to go through a Conditional Use process so there is a discretionary review regardless of what the architecture is. Mr. Watt stated this is a good practice.

Mr. Watt suggested to table this agenda item since there are a lot of points that the architect and his client should discuss. Mr. Watt also pointed out it would be very beneficial if staff could research what the agreement was in regards to what the applicant had to install back on the building.

Mr. Watt made a motion to table this agenda item. Ms. French seconded the motion.

Mr. Watt referred back to the canopy and emphasized the importance of being aesthetic. Mr. Watt added he would be in favor of the canopy if it was not the roll up type. Mr. Watt also pointed out the importance of safety when it comes to the heaters being under the proposed canopy. Mr. Skoglind wanted to see more specifics on the canopy such as exterior covering, enclosures etc.

Mr. Meyer wondered if putting up a fixed awning over the two bar tops would be permissible or more favorable to the commission.

Mr. Skoglind next touched on the signage. Mr. Miller also stressed the importance of finding out what the agreement was when the building was rebuilt. Mr. Perry said research is needed to get the answer to the questions, but it is more likely that it was part of a BZA approval that has long been expired.

Mr. Meyer was wondering if the owners and future tenant wanted to put the marquee back (replica) it would need to go to BZA and HAPC. Mr. Perry said it would have to.

With a voice vote, all were in favor of tabling this agenda item.

Mr. Watt asked the applicant how the project coming along on the Caroline Harrison building. Mr. Meyer said the bar layout changed, the bar tops are replaced with storefront windows as was original designed. There would be two overhead doors on the College Street side to access the patio, and the accordion doors on the High Street side. Mr. Meyer briefly touched on the project for Bolin & Troy at 9 S College to answer to Mr. Skoglind's inquiry.

VI. Administrative Decisions (Previously Decided)

Mr. Skoglind provided a brief overview of the administratively approved projects below.

HAPC-2022-01, 12 N College Avenue, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, paint exterior including doors, sills, trims, gutters, and soffits, and remove 4 unused exterior doors, **Austin Embrey, Applicant**

HAPC-2022-02, 9 S College Avenue, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, wall sign for

Bolin & Troy, **Triangle Sign Company, LLC, Applicant/Agent**

HAPC-2022-03, 10 E Walnut Street, Buffalo Wild Wings, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, re-facing existing logo sign and awning, **Atlantic Sign Company, Applicant/Agent**

Mr. Skoglind also commented on the interior remodels that were taking place inside of the restaurant.

Mr. Skoglind mentioned he gave a presentation to the Planning Commission the day before. Mr. Skoglind said a comment was made that it would be nice to see more color on High Street as well as other architectural elements.

Mr. Miller mentioned he and Mr. Perry took a walk at Over-the-Rhine after they attended the NAPC Forum in Cincinnati to observe the architecture and how they mimic the historic buildings that once were there. Some pictures were taken too.

Mr. Spurlock thanked the Commission for electing him to serve on HAPC, and he is looking forward to working with them.

Ms. French reminded the commission an email will soon go out to discuss details about the cemetery tours.

Mr. Watt noted that the HAPC presentation to the Planning Commission helped the members to see how HAPC looks at the bigger picture and not just one or two aspects when making a decision on a COA.

VII. Adjournment

Mr. Spurlock made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Watt seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.