



AGENDA
HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, February 11, 2026
6:00 P.M.

Oxford Courthouse
118 W High Street

MEMBERS

Dana Miller, Chair

Corey Watt, Planning Commission Representative	Alex French, Council Representative
Kelsey Stryffe	Brad Spurlock, Vice-Chair
Alia Levar Wegner	Sean Wagner

STAFF

Sam Perry, Director, Community Development

MEETING PROCEDURE: Comments from the public are welcome at two different times during the course of the meeting:
(1) Comments on items not on the Agenda will be heard under Public Comments – and
(2) Comments for all public hearing items will be heard during HAPC consideration of said item. Please wait until you are recognized by the Chair, join the Commission table, state your name and address so that your comments may be properly recorded and limit your remarks to a period of four minutes or less.

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Agenda
- III. Annual Election of Officers
- IV. Public Comments
- V. Approval of Minutes of January 14, 2026 1
- VI. New Business
- HAPC-2026-02, 110 E High Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, demolition of existing vacant bookstore building and construction of new principal mixed-use building, Emily Lubbers, Applicant/Agent** **4**
- VII. Adjournment

HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION (HAPC)
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, January 14, 2026
6:00 P.M.

I. Call to Order

The January 14, 2026 meeting of the Oxford Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Brad Spurlock.

Those members present: Sean Wagner, Alia Levar Wegner, Kelsey Stryffe, and Brad Spurlock

Those members excused: Dana Miller, Alex French, Corey Watt

Staff members present: Sam Perry, Community Development Director

Staff members excused: None

II. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Wagner made a motion to approve the agenda. Ms. Stryffe seconded the motion. All were in favor.

III. Annual Election of Officers

Ms. Stryffe made a motion to table the annual election of officers. Ms. Wegner seconded the motion. All were in favor.

IV. Public Comments

There were no comments from the public.

V. Approval of Minutes of November 12, 2025

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

VI. Discussion Items

HAPC-2025-11, 110 E High Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS pre-application discussion, demolition of existing vacant bookstore building and construction of new principal mixed-use building, **Emily Lubbers, Applicant/Agent**

Mr. Perry began his presentation by mentioning there was a previous pre-application and vote on the demolition of this building and construction of a new building, but that had been expired. Mr. Perry also mentioned the category of the building had been changed from historic to non-contributing thus allowing demolition.

Mr. Perry next showed the rendering and explained that the Zoning Code allows a four-story building. Mr. Perry mentioned that this rendering is a little bit different from the previous

submittal but the massing and the amount of glasses are similar. Mr. Perry pointed out the City has a joint application with the Land Bank for funding for site demolition and remediation.

Ms. Lubbers was invited to join the conversation. Ms. Lubbers pointed out the design is now simplified compared to the previous one and the windows are not as dark. Ms. Lubbers explained the two main components in the design are the modern element and the more traditional element. The biggest difference is the floor plan stated Ms. Lubbers. There are still four floors, but the first floor is now completely open to accommodate a single tenant, however, there is no tenant secured at this time. Also, the main entrance for the students has been moved to a different location. Ms. Lubbers explained the previous floor plan had more of a 2–3-bedroom ratio, but the current one has 3-4 bedrooms. Ms. Lubbers emphasized they are anticipating two colors of brick, metal siding, and a larger format cast stone. Ms. Lubbers informed the Commission the intention is that the building be occupied by the 2028 academic year.

Ms. Lubbers explained that due to liability reasons the balconies have been eliminated. Ms. Lubbers next expanded on the metal paneling which is designed to look like a metal siding. Ms. Lubbers summarized the four elements on the building are the two colors of brick, the metal paneling, and the large format cast stone.

Mr. Spurlock wondered about the durability of the metal paneling. Ms. Lubbers said it is more durable than a siding product but less durable than a masonry product. It also requires less maintenance than a normal siding would.

Ms. Wegner would like to see more white colors incorporated in the design to contribute to a more historical façade.

Mr. Spurlock mentioned the Commission received a note from Steve Gordon regarding this case. Mr. Gordon's main concerns are the massing of the building and the cornice. Mr. Gordon suggested recessing the upper floor of the building. Ms. Lubbers pointed out there is a small recess to match the building with the one next to it. Ms. Lubbers mentioned the roof space is planned to be used actively, and the walls are going to be higher there.

Mr. Perry asked Ms. Lubbers if the floor area ratio maximum was increased, would that give more flexibility on recessing the façade by adding more square footage elsewhere. Ms. Lubbers stated that it possibly could.

Ms. Lubbers explained the contractor is expecting 18-20 months for the work to be done.

Mr. Spurlock spoke positively about the design. Mr. Wagner also liked the design.

Ms. Jessica Greene, Assistant City Manager, mentioned the City is working with Butler County Land Bank on receiving funding for the demolition of the site and remediation. Ms. Greene also liked the design and the concept. Ms. Greene emphasized the City anticipates hearing the final result about the funding in March.

Mr. Perry asked Ms. Lubbers if the remediation/demolition funding through the Land Bank was critical to the project. Ms. Lubbers stated that it was not critical but is helpful.

Ms. Lubbers thanked the Commission for their feedback and stated that she hoped to be on the February agenda.

Mr. Spurlock asked if there were any further topics to discuss among the Commission and there were none.

VII. Adjournment

Ms. Stryffe made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wagner seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 6:39 pm.



MEMORANDUM
Community Development Department
513-524-5204

TO: Historic & Architectural Preservation Commission

FROM: Sam Perry, AICP
Director | HAPC Administrator

MEETING DATE: February 11, 2026

RE: **HAPC-2026-02, 110 E. High St, demolition and new mixed-use building**

At the January 14, 2026 meeting, the Commission held a pre-application discussion in response to a preliminary design for 110 E. High Street. The Commission members provided feedback to Architect Emily Lubbers of MSP Design on behalf of the owner Benjamin Federbush of Varick Realty. Commission members provided feedback/questions about material durability and colors. Staff observations of the four HAPC members in attendance, were that there were no major concerns with the overall design being presented. The Commission also shared a comment letter from Mr. Steve Gordon which questioned building massing and cornice design. Ms. Lubbers submitted the enclosed new Certificate of Appropriateness application packet which responded to some of the feedback, such as color and cornice.

This memo summarizes the city code requirements related to the Commission’s review of the proposed demolition of the existing building and proposed new building.

Demolition of the Existing Building

Per Oxford Code 1152.09, a demolition of the existing building can be approved because the existing building has been categorized in the Uptown District Inventory as “Historic Non-Contributing.” This was a change made in 2024 in response to a special architectural analysis.

Certificate of Appropriateness Review Criteria – 1152.07(f)

A. The proposed development complies with all the requirements of this code and other related codes and ordinances enforced by the City;

B. Properties which contribute to the character of the historic district shall be retained, with their historic architectural features intact and altered as little as possible;

C. Any alteration of an existing property shall be compatible with its historic character, as well as with the surrounding district;

D. New construction shall be compatible with the district in which it is located;

E. The application demonstrates compliance with any historic guidelines or policies adopted by the City of Oxford that are applicable to the subject application; and

F. In determining compatibility, the HAPC shall consider the following:

1. The general design, character, and appropriateness to the property of the proposed alteration or new construction;

2. The scale of the proposed alteration or new construction in relation to the property itself, surrounding properties, and the neighborhood;

G. The texture, materials, and color and their relation to similar features of other properties in the neighborhood;

H. The visual compatibility with surrounding properties, including proportion of the properties façade, roof shape, and the rhythm of spacing of properties on streets, including setback; and

I. The importance of historic, architectural, or other features to the significance of the property.

Staff Commentary:

The overall design is similar in massing to the 2024 expired COA approval. The narrative letter describes the concepts and feedback that influenced the design. The proposed building is a four-story 52,355 square foot mixed-use building with a significant glass/spandrel feature on the primary corner of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th floors. The exterior building materials are brick veneer, fiber cement panels, smooth stone veneer, and pre-cast bands, headers, sills, and cornices. The building is designed to appear as multiple smaller buildings, as opposed to one large building.

The architect is planning to bring material samples to the meeting to share with Commission members. Three-dimensional color concept renderings as well as elevation/plan drawings have been provided. The Commission should use whatever means necessary to evaluate the proposed design according to the review criteria: Review of renderings, questions of the architect, and field visits. The Commission should make a decision within 60 days of this meeting, per Chapter 1152. If all of the information is provided and no revisions or new information is needed, the Commission can make a final decision at this meeting. The design team would like to start construction in 2026 and have the building completed in summer 2028.

January 23, 2025

Sam Perry
Community Development Director
City of Oxford

RE: Certificate of Appropriateness Pre-Application Meeting
For: Benjy Federbush
AT: 110 E. High Street, Oxford, OH 45056

Dear Mr. Perry:

This letter serves as an official request to submit a Certificate of Appropriateness application for a proposed mixed-use building located at 110 E. High Street.

The project involves demolishing the existing one- and two-story buildings on the site and constructing a new four-story, 52,355-square-foot mixed-use building. The first floor will include retail space, the residential entry, a trash collection room for residents, and a mail/package delivery room. Floors two through four will consist of multi-family housing designed with Miami University students in mind and will feature a mix of two-, three-, and four-bedroom units. The first floor occupies most of the site, while the second through fourth floors form a U-shape toward the rear, ensuring that every bedroom has access to natural light and code-required egress windows. Additional cutouts on the fourth floor provide visual interest and help ease the transition between the proposed building and adjacent existing structures.


The exterior design incorporates brick veneer, fiber cement panels, smooth stone veneer, and pre-cast bands, headers, sills, and cornices. The first floor includes extensive aluminum storefront glazing to create an active, welcoming street frontage. To reflect the character of the surrounding neighborhood, the building façade has been designed to read as a series of smaller structures rather than one continuous mass. Two brick colors within the red family are proposed—a darker brown/burgundy and a lighter mauve—complemented by cream and tan pre-cast and stone elements. The upper-floor windows follow a consistent, rhythmic pattern. MSP will provide physical samples of all materials for review during the meeting.

During the pre-application meeting, recommendations included incorporating accent colors—such as white—to reflect the history and character of the neighborhood, revisiting the cornice design, and ensuring that the first-floor storefront effectively activates the street level. MSP Design carefully considered each of these comments and incorporated updated cornices as well as a slightly revised color palette.

While the building features a modern aesthetic overall, we believe the design continues to respect the rhythm, scale, and character of the surrounding neighborhood. We recognize that the Certificate of Appropriateness process is collaborative, and we look forward to working with the City of Oxford and the HAPC to refine the design and create a project that the owner, design team, and City can all be proud of.

If we can provide any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,



Emily Lubbers, AIA NCIDQ
Project Architect
513-759-3212
elubbers@mspdesign.com
McGill Smith Punshon, Inc.



CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION

Please print legibly. To apply, email completed form and plans in PDF format to commdev@cityofoxford.org

BOX 1 | APPLICATION TYPE Select one

- Pre-Application for Certificate of Appropriateness
- Certificate of Appropriateness

BOX 2 | APPLICATION DETAILS

Property Address/Location 110 E. High Street, Oxford, Ohio 45056

Building Name

Does the proposal involve demolishing an existing building? Yes No

Description of Proposed Change(s) Proposed changes would include the demolition of the existing one and two-story buildings on the property and building a new four-story mixed-use building. The building is intended to be retail on the first floor with floors two thru floor being multi-family housing.

BOX 3 | APPLICANT INFORMATION

Is the applicant also the current property owner?

- Yes (You may skip Box 4)
- No (Do not skip Box 4, and include a [Letter of Agency](#) with your submittal)

Applicant Name Emily Lubbers

Applicant Company Name MSP Design

Mailing Address 3700 Park 42 Drive, Suite 190B, Cincinnati, OH 45247

Email Address elubbers@mspdesign.com

Telephone Number 513-759-3212

BOX 4 | PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION Check if same as Applicant

Property Owner Name Benjamin W. Federbush

Property Owner Company Name Varick Realty

Mailing Address 185 Varick Street, Suite 305, New York, NY 10014

Email Address bwf@varickrealty.com

Telephone Number 917-776-4307

BOX 5 | ARCHITECT INFORMATION Check if same as Applicant

Architect/Engineer Name

Company Name

Mailing Address

Email Address

Telephone Number

BOX 6 | ATTACHMENT CHECKLIST Submit all contents in **PDF format**. No printed copies are necessary.

- Narrative/Cover Letter** providing a written description of the proposed exterior change(s)
- Elevations, site plans, renderings, diagrams, photo simulations, and/or other items** necessary to accurately illustrate the details of proposed exterior change(s)
- Photos** of existing site conditions

Note: Upon checking an application for completeness, staff may require additional information and/or materials above and beyond the items listed above in order to perform a complete evaluation for compliance with relevant Code provisions. You are welcome to contact Community Development at 513-524-5204 ahead of submission to determine whether additional items may be required. For example, a **material sample** may be requested for certain small-scale changes such as new signage, doors, etc.

BOX 7 | APPLICANT SIGNATURE

As the owner or owner's agent, I hereby agree all information contained in this application is true, accurate, and complete to the best of my knowledge. I acknowledge the application will first be checked by City staff for completeness prior to processing. Upon intake, staff will consult the Chair of the Historic & Architectural Preservation Commission (HAPC) to determine whether an application is approvable in an administrative fashion, or will require being heard by the full Commission at a regular meeting date.

Applicant Name (Print) Emily Lubbers

Applicant Signature

Emily Lubbers

Digitally signed by Emily Lubbers
DN: C=US, E=elubbers@mspdesign.com, O=MSP Design,
CN=Emily Lubbers
Date: 2026.01.23 13:42:17-05'00'

Date 1/23/26

Processing Fee

The appropriate processing fee amount will be determined during a completeness check by Community Development staff. It may take 1-2 business days for a completeness check to be performed. The applicant will receive a digital copy of a processing fee invoice via email once it is ready. Fees may be paid in-person by check or credit card at the Finance Department window on the first floor of the Oxford Municipal Building, 15 S College Avenue, Oxford OH 45056. For credit card payments, the City accepts Visa, MasterCard, or Discover, and such payments may also be taken over the phone by calling our Finance Department Utilities line at 513-524-5221, Option 1.

Bond Requirement for Demolitions

Be aware that any future [Demolition Permit](#) cannot issued unless accompanied by a COA and shall include:

- (1) a **performance bond** posting with security equivalent to 100% of the approved cost of leveling the site, filling with soil and sodding or seeding the surface.
- (2) payment of a **mitigation fee** of ten percent (10%) of the approved demolition cost.

COA Review Criteria

For source text, refer to Oxford Zoning Code [Section 1152.07\(f\)](#)

Decisions on a COA application shall be based on consideration of the following criteria:

- (1) The proposed development complies with all the requirements of this code and other related codes and ordinances enforced by the City;
- (2) Properties which contribute to the character of the historic district shall be retained, with their historic architectural features intact and altered as little as possible;
- (3) Any alteration of an existing property shall be compatible with its historic character, as well as with the surrounding district;
- (4) New construction shall be compatible with the district in which it is located;
- (5) The application demonstrates compliance with any historic guidelines or policies adopted by the City of Oxford that are applicable to the subject application; and
- (6) In determining compatibility, the HAPC shall consider the following:
 - A. The general design, character, and appropriateness to the property of the proposed alteration or new construction;
 - B. The scale of the proposed alteration or new construction in relation to the property itself, surrounding properties, and the neighborhood;
 - C. The texture, materials, and color and their relation to similar features of other properties in the neighborhood;
 - D. The visual compatibility with surrounding properties, including proportion of the properties façade, roof shape, and the rhythm of spacing of properties on streets, including setback; and
 - E. The importance of historic, architectural, or other features to the significance of the property.
- (7) In its considerations of whether an application is deserving of an approval, the HAPC may also consider the cost of modifications or other proposals, where costs for a particular action or inaction may be unreasonable given existing conditions of a structure, site, or area.
- (8) The HAPC shall encourage alterations and repairs to historic structures and to structures in historic districts in the spirit of their existing architectural style; however, additions in styles different than the existing structure may be approved if such additions complement the existing architectural style. The HAPC shall be flexible in its judgment of plans for alteration, repair, or demolition of structures, sites, and areas of little historic or cultural value except where such alteration, repair, or demolition would seriously impair the historic value and character of surrounding structures or of the surrounding area. It is not the intent of this Chapter to limit alteration or repair to any one period of architectural style.

Demolition Approval Criteria

For source text, refer to Oxford Zoning Code [Section 1152.09\(e\)](#)

The HAPC may approve a COA for demolition only if one of the following is satisfied:

- (1) The applicant has given clear evidence that the structure has incurred extensive damage to its basic structural elements such as roof, wall, and foundation requiring substantial reconstruction, and the structure presents an immediate danger to the public health, safety, or welfare as declared by the Chief Building Official (condemnation) but that such damage was not done through neglect of the property by the owner or former owners; or
- (2) The demolition is proposed for a structure that is identified as non-contributing or historic non-contributing in an adopted inventory of the applicable zoning district; or
- (3) The applicant demonstrates that the following conditions are met based on the designation of the site or structure in an adopted historic inventory:
 - A. Historic Structures
 - i. The applicant must demonstrate that the costs to rehabilitate or renovate the structure to a purposeful use exceeds 50 percent of the fair market value.
 - ii. The City shall reserve the right to have an individual or entity that is not a member of HAPC to assess the financial feasibility of renovating the structure.
 - iii. The COA shall not be approved if the cause of such damage was due to neglect by the owner or previous owners.
 - B. Non-Historic Contributing Structures
 - i. The removal will not adversely affect the architectural or historic integrity of the streetscape; or
 - ii. The structure is not consistent with other structures in the district in terms of historic character, architectural style, construction material, height, setback, or mass.

LETTER OF AGENCY

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that

(Applicant Name)

has permission to represent our interest with the City of Oxford regarding

(Application Description)

located at

(Property Address/Location)

Thank you,

(Property Owner Printed Name – must be a person)

(Property Owner Company Name – if applicable)

(Property Owner Signature – must correspond to printed name above)

(Date)















