HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION (HAPC)
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, August 10, 2022
6:15 P.M.

I. Call to Order

The August 10, 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, Hueston Kyger, Brad Spurlock, Corey Watt
Those members excused: Dana Miller, Sean Wagner
Staff members present: Sam Perry, Community Development Director
Staff members excused: None

II. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Kyger made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. French seconded the motion. All were in favor.

III. Public Comments

There were none.

IV. Approval of Minutes of July 13, 2022

Ms. French made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Watt seconded the motion. All were in favor.

V. Old Business

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

Mr. Watt made a motion to take this case off the table. Mr. Kyger seconded the motion.

Mr. Humphrey represented Mr. Meyer at the meeting. Mr. Humphrey stated there were not many chances to discuss the case but he is happy to answer any questions the Commission has.

Mr. Skoglind inquired whether there was further discussion on the signage. Mr. Humphrey said if the project is approved the intent is to replicate the Princess sign that once was on the building.

Mr. Watt recalled the conversation about the frame of the canopy, the storage of it, and the permanency of it. Mr. Skoglind joined the conversation and asked Mr. Humphrey about the permanency of the structure and the roof material. Mr. Humphrey answered the roof cover would be cloth material and retractable but the frame is permanent.

Mr. Skoglind recalled there was a discussion about a knee wall. Mr. Humphrey stated the proposal is a decorative fence that would enclose the patio. It would have gates as well.

Ms. French inquired whether there was a community outreach to local businesses and residents in the surrounding area to explain what the proposed project is, and the noise level. Mr. Humphrey could not answer to this question.

Mr. Watt thanked Mr. Humphrey for representing Mr. Meyer. Because of the circumstances, Mr. Watt wondered whether this case can be re-tabled. Mr. Perry said it is possible. Mr. Watt and Mr. Skoglind agreed it would be beneficial to give more time to the applicant and Mr. Meyer to provide answers to the questions that the Commission has, and also for the Commission to make a decision based on all the information that the applicant can provide.

Mr. Kyger was in favor of the project but he also had questions about the permanency of the structure, the awning, how it is going to be attached to the building. Mr. Skoglind asked the Commission to keep in mind the size of the area where the proposed structure would go.

Mr. Perry summarized the discussion: the Commission would like to see more information on the permanency of the attachment for the different features, the length of the time when it would be in use.

Mr. Watt added the project is a great idea and encourages outdoor seating but at the same time the Commission wants to make sure that the patio is not going to turn into a storage space when it is not in use. Mr. Skoglind re-emphasized it would be great if the applicant could talk to the surrounding property owners about the project.

<u>Mr. Watt made a motion to table this case to the next meeting. Mr. Kyger seconded the motion.</u> All were in favor.

Seth Cropenbaker, Assistant to the City Manager
Mr. Cropenbaker spoke in favor of the proposed project. Mr. Cropenbaker stated this would contribute to creating more outdoor dining paces which would help the local business thrive. Mr. Cropenbaker informed the Commission there is a legislation underway that would allow more outdoor dining spaces to be created in the public right-of-way. Mr. Cropenbaker asked the Commission if there is any guidelines they can offer to make it clearer to owners what is acceptable and what is not, in the Historic District, and it could be part of this legislation proposal.

VI. New Business

HAPC-2022-05, 22 South Beech Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, demolition of an existing structure and the construction of a new mixed-use building, Scott Webb, Architect/Agent

Mr. Webb stated this project is in the process for a few years now, and it is back before the HAPC because the COA expired.

Mr. Perry stated the building that is going to be demolished is a non-contributing historic building, and there is nothing worthy of preserving. Mr. Perry added the Commission in this case wants to make sure that the new design is appropriate with the overall district.

Mr. Webb said the proposal is the same that was approved before. Mr. Perry added he and Mr. Webb had a discussion about the conditions of approval, what is required.

Ms. French inquired whether there was a precedent for a building where the first floor is a hotel annex and apartments above. Mr. Webb said it is more common in big cities. Ms. French liked the idea of connectivity in design with the Elms Hotel. Mr. Webb added the applicant is researching to find the appropriate glass railing, which they will provide a sample.

Mr. Watt inquired if there was any changes in products. Mr. Webb said everything is still available at this time.

Mr. Watt made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions listed in the May 2021 approval. Mr. Spurlock seconded the motion. All were in favor.

HAPC-2022-06, 48 East Park Place, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, new mixed-use building, **Scott Webb, Architect/Agent**

Mr. Perry briefly explained there was a building on this site previously that got demolished without an HAPC approval. Mr. Watt inquired if HAPC denied the demolition and why. Mr. Perry said yes it was denied. The code was different at that time, and there was no inventory to go by, Mr. Perry added.

Mr. Webb said this application had a pre-application review last year. Mr. Webb then described the site condition: it is encumbered, and a big power line is located on the north side of the property which powers the hospital. Mr. Webb added that the Code does not require a setback but Duke Energy does. On the east side, there is an access easement to the backdoor of Apple Tree. Mr. Webb added there is going to be a designated place for the trash in the northern corner. Mr. Watt wanted to know if the location of the trash is acceptable to Duke. Mr. Webb said it is not a problem.

Mr. Webb informed the Commission one of the colors for the brick that was first chosen, darker gray, it is not an easy color to get in brick. For this reason, a lighter gray color has been chosen. Mr. Webb then shared a sample of that with the Commission. Mr. Webb explained the gray color would be at the 3rd floor line on the building as a rowlock over soldier course, and brown solider course on the smaller building at the 2nd floor line giving some kind of depth to the building this way. The window sills would be brown rowlock, and the window trims and cornice work would be gray color.

Mr. Webb next talked about the awnings, which would be intended to work as signs as well. The green would be the primary entrance to the residences, the brown would be to the business.

Mr. Webb next briefly overviewed the cornice details. Mr. Watt inquired what the feature on the top of the small building called. Mr. Webb said it is just a cornice. On the brown building, it is a modern version whereas on the gray building it is more of an antique vision. Mr. Skoglind and Mr. Kyger wanted to know whether the 4ft floor is accessible from the 3rd floor. Mr. Webb said no, it will be accessible from a staircase located at the back corner of the gray building. But there is no roof deck.

Mr. Webb informed the Commission a restaurant tenant is interested in the ground floor, and they are interested in creating an outdoor space. Mr. Webb said this could be possible underneath the power line by adding a patio, awning and more storefront on the north side of the building.

Mr. Webb next shared the construction drawings with the Commission. Mr. Webb thought with the park being so close this would create a good opportunity for someone to operate a take-out business. Mr. Webb added the entire building would be all brick, and there is no cast stone anywhere. Mr. Webb briefly spoke about the lighting. The lights would be straight arm lights with a can, the same as it was used on the DuBois building. Mr. Webb stated the intention is for the sign to be painted on the awning.

Mr. Webb next provided samples for the awning material/colors. Mr. Webb then explained the storefront would be bronze color with a 10% tint on the glass windows. The upper window sills and window heads would be painted with a darker color. The windows would have a single mullion in each sash. Mr. Perry asked where the muntin would be. Mr. Perry used the Police Department's building as an example of a 3-piece muntin. Mr. Perry added it would look better on the outside. Mr. Webb agreed and said that is where he prefers the muntin as well. The Commission agreed with Mr. Perry and Mr. Webb on the placement of the muntin.

Mr. Watt wanted to know how big the stair system located on the top of the smaller building. Mr. Webb said it will be visible minimally. Mr. Perry had a question on the pilaster concept whether it is a relief. Mr. Webb said it is a control joint.

Mr. Kyger made a motion to approve the COA with the conditions discussed and presented by Staff. Mr. Watt seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Skoglind asked Mr. Perry whether there was any update on the Design Guidelines. Mr. Perry said that he got some recommendations from the Cincinnati Preservation Association.

Mr. Watt inquired from Mr. Perry if an area can be dual zoned. Mr. Perry said the City has the ability to use overlay zones, to use additional standards. Mr. Perry added if there is no other board that does design review and HAPC would want to go to this direction the Commission would steer more towards a design review committee and not just Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission. Mr. Watt expressed his interest in this.

Mr. Spurlock stated the Hamilton Architectural Design Review Board, which he is a board member of, also regulates OHI properties. Mr. Spurlock wanted to know whether there was any discussion about that here in Oxford. Mr. Perry did not think so.

Mr. Watt made the comment the buildings that have been built in the Historic District are better than what they replaced. Mr. Watt considered this as an improvement.

Mr. Skoglind highlighted there is a history with the building at 10 N Beech St (Princess Theater) and this makes the decision making harder. At the same time, Mr. Skoglind emphasized the Commission needs to focus on what is presented in the application, and not to drag in anything that previously happened. Mr. Skoglind thanked the Commission members for their approach on this application and for being understanding. Mr. Watt expressed his desire to help out with outdoor eating spaces. Mr. Skoglind added to the conversation although the noise is a concern it is not in the purview of HAPC.

Mr. Watt and Ms. French agreed on the benefits of making pedestrian alleys. One possibility Mr. Watt mentioned the area between Left Field Tavern and Corner Bar as an example.

Ms. French stated she is working with Mr. Spurlock on the Historic Cemetery Tours for October. Oxford Cemetery Association gave permission to the tours, and Ms. French is meeting with Mr. Wooddell to work on a liability waiver for those signing up for the tour.

VII. Adjournment

Ms. French made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Kyger seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 7:43 pm.