HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION (HAPC)
MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, July 8, 2026
6:00 P.M.

I. Call to Order

The July 8, 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, Alex French, Corey Watt, and Brad Spurlock
Those members excused: Alia Levar Wegner, Dana Miller, and Kelsey Stryffe
Staff members present: Sam Perry, Community Development Director
Staff members excused: None

II. Approval of Agenda

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

III. Public Comments

There were no comments from the public.

IV. Approval of Minutes of March 11, 2026

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

V. New Business

COFA-2026-04, 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**

Mr. Perry noted there was a pre-application several months ago which is a requirement by the City Code for every new building in the Historic District. Mr. Perry mentioned there were comments submitted by Steve Gordon. These comments were discussed at the March meeting and shared with the architect. There was also a delay from the applicant's client who was waiting for the outcome of an application request that the City had helped facilitate through the Butler County Land Bank. This application has now been completed, and the funds are set aside thorough the Brownfield Remediation Program.

Mr. Perry next talked about the currently proposed building which is very similar in scale, mass, and material to the one submitted at the pre-application meeting. There are some changes to the cornice detail and the color of the fiber cement panel. Mr. Perry pointed out that staff recommendation is to approve the project because the applicant was receptive to the feedback and to the comments from Mr. Gordon. Mr. Perry mentioned that the applicant is intending to submit a demolition and building permit application at the same time if this project is approved by the HAPC. This process is usually more complex than submitting the two applications separately. Mr. Watt asked Mr. Perry to elaborate on this topic. Mr. Perry explained there are requirements for documentation such as all the taxes have been paid, a waste management plan especially if asbestos is present, and all utilities have been properly disconnected. Mr. Perry also pointed out that the demolition will be very complex because of the remediation. Mr. Watt also inquired whether there is a difference in timeline if the applications are submitted separately or together. Mr. Perry said there really is not a difference.

Mr. Perry pointed out that the applicant would like to emphasize there is more time that is needed than what the Code allows because of the complexity of the remediation process. The applicant would like two years to have the building permit in place. Mr. Perry explained that the time request is acceptable in this case because the remediation could take longer. There are probably going to be various departments of the state that need to verify the funds are spent correctly and the remediation is done correctly, added Mr. Perry. The lead time on this is unknown, therefore the two years would help them.

Ms. Lubbers started her presentation by explaining the extension they are requesting is for the duration of the construction. Ms. Lubbers also explained that the anticipated duration of the remediation and demolition is six months in best case scenario due to the necessary approvals from state and federal agencies. Also, the construction of a building of this size, approximately 52,200 sq ft, is at least 18 months. Ms. Lubbers clarified that the request is that the COA would be valid for one year to have the building permit in place, but the time allotted for construction is to be three years.

Mr. Watt inquired about the samples and colors. Ms. Lubbers said there are two red brick colors. Ms. Lubbers also mentioned that based on the feedback from the pre-application meeting the original darker metal panel is now replaced with a white fiber cement panel. Ms. Lubbers explained they are implementing new technology for the cornices which will be a lightweight material. It is a foam-filled product that hangs on cleats, and it is more affordable and durable. It is a cast and can be made in any shape.

Mr. Watt also wanted to know more about the roof access. Ms. Lubbers stated there is one area on the roof that is intended to be occupied with full height walls. Ms. Lubbers added that the mechanical units will not be visible from the street. The only thing they anticipate on the roof top is some type of exhaust hood if the first-floor tenant is a restaurant, explained Ms. Lubbers.

Mr. Watt inquired about the placement of the waste wheelers. Ms. Lubbers said the parcel adjacent would have the storage of waste wheelers since both properties have the same owner. Mr. Watt would like a condition for trash management in case the parcel adjacent to this property is no longer available.

Ms. French wanted to know whether there will be a built-in blinds or similar window feature on the corner. Ms. Lubbers said there were discussions about what type of shade will be provided but there are no definite plans yet.

Seth Cropenbaker, Economic Development Specialist from the City spoke in favor of this project. Mr. Cropenbaker also talked about the indirect and direct impact that this project would have. Mr.

Cropenbaker mentioned the improvement of public-private partnership because of this project. Mr. Cropenbaker explained that this project has garnered the largest award that was designated through the Landbank.

Ted Pickerill from the President's Office at Miami University spoke to express support for this project. Mr. Pickerill spoke about the positive impact this project will have on the students.

Ms. French agreed with Mr. Watt to have a condition on waste management plan. Mr. Perry read a proposed condition: "That the design team develop primary and secondary trash management plans as approved by staff that ensures dedicated land is retained for trash storage and management in the event that the parcel of land across the alley is no longer available." Ms. French was in favor to approve the project as proposed.

Mr. Wagner spoke in favor of the project. Mr. Spurlock was also in favor of the design.

<u>Mr. Watt made a motion to approve the project as proposed with the following conditions. Ms. French seconded the motion.</u> All were in favor.

1. All exterior material samples will be reviewed and approved prior to building permit issuance.
2. Any exterior design changes will be reviewed and approved prior to building permit issuance.
3. The COA shall be valid for one year from the date of this COA approval, which is July 8, 2027. At which time, if a building permit has not been issued by that date, the COA will be void. The building shall be substantially complete according to the approved COA and any subsequent amendments on or before three years from the date of issuance of the building permit. Any requests for additional time extensions will be reviewed on the merits of the circumstances provided to the HAPC at the time of review.
4. Throughout the project timeline, the property and adjacent right-of-way shall be maintained per City of Oxford Right-of-Way, Zoning, Building, Fire, and Property Maintenance Codes. Due to the prominent location of the property, substantial effort shall be made to keep the site in a clean, organized and safe manner, free of loose debris as well as allowance to the public for sidewalk accessibility to the greatest extent feasible during construction activity.
5. That the design team develop primary and secondary trash management plans as approved by staff that ensures dedicated land is retained for trash storage and management in the event that the parcel of land across the alley is no longer available.

VI. Preservation Plan and Design Guidelines Update

Mr. Perry mentioned that it is still Preservation Forward who the City is working with under the umbrella of McKenna. The City has contracted with them with an extra $16,000 to expand on the infill Design Guidelines and to do a workshop on how to use the Design Guidelines which is planned for September 10.

Mr. Perry asked the Commission's help to review the Preservation Plan. Mr. Perry also mentioned that the consultant did not use the GIS data that was sent to them about which building should be preserved in the Mile Square.

VII. Administrative Decisions

HAPC-2026-03, 6 N Beech Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, wall sign replacement, Lisa Leishman, Applicant/Agent

HAPC-2026-04, 130 E High Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, balcony railing, Jim O'Donnell, Applicant/Agent

HAPC-2026-05, 107 E Church Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, sign face change, Lois Wellner, Applicant/Agent

HAPC-2026-06, 7 W High Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, lighting on front façade, Michael Martin, Applicant/Agent

COFA-2026-0001, 101 N Main Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, replacement of HVAC units, Nick Fears, Applicant/Agent

COFA-2026-0002, 122 S Campus Avenue, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, window replacements, Jim McGrath, Applicant/Agent

COFA-2026-0003, 45 E High Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, new wall sign, Ashley Higgins, Applicant/Agent

COFA-2026-0005, 127 W Church Street, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, new wall sign, Jamie Campbell, Applicant/Agent

VIII. Adjournment

Ms. French made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wagner seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 7:19pm.