AGENDA
HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 8, 2020
6:15 P.M.

Per Ohio House Bill 197, This meeting is being held
via videoconference and/or via teleconference only

MEMBERS
Christopher Skoglind, Chair
Edna Southard, Council Representative
Chad Smith
Hueston Kyger
Corey Watt, Planning Commission Representative
Dana Miller
Sean Wagner

STAFF
Sam Perry, Director, Community Development

MEETING PROCEDURE: This meeting is being held as an essential service of municipal governance in accordance with Ohio House Bill 197. Comments from the public are welcome during agenda items only as follows:
(1) Comments for all public hearing items will be heard during HAPC consideration of said item. Please wait until you are recognized by the Chair, 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. New Business
HAPC-2020-06, 28 W High Street, installation of new windows and change of exterior paint color, Scott Webb, Applicant

HAPC-2020-08, 101 W Church, Pre-Application, demolition and proposed four story structure, Norm Butt, The Architectural Group, Applicant/Agent

HAPC-2020-09, 36 E High Street, Brick Street, addition of a second floor patio, Mark Weisman, Applicant

IV. Adjournment
MEMO

TO: Historic & Architectural Preservation Commission
FROM: Sam Perry
DATE: July 1, 2020
MEETING: July 8, 2020
SUBJECT: 28 W. High Street Side Windows
APPLICANT: Scott Webb

Per Oxford Chapter 1152, new windows in any visible building façade require a Certificate of Appropriateness from HAPC. The proposal is for six new window openings in the 3rd and 4th floors of the west side façade of the existing building addressed as 26-28 W. High Street. The proposal also includes re-painting of the façade from red to white in order to lower the heat absorption leading to longevity of the surface. An administrative approval was considered. Ultimately, it was decided to discuss this case with the full Commission because of new window openings.

The building is in the Uptown Historic District and categorized as “Historic”, which has the highest level of protection of the four categories. The building and current owner, applied for and received a historic marker in 2010 for this building for the preservation / conversion efforts. The plaque can be seen mounted on the building at the sidewalk level.

Element #8, pages 41-42 of the Design Guidelines give some general guidance, but do not contain specific detail on how to handle side facades of historic mixed-usage or commercial buildings. Staff has had some correspondence with the applicant to understand the rationale and approach.

Staff’s perspective is that a side façade should receive less scrutiny than a front façade because of the potential for future construction. That said, any changes, should not take away from the building or the surrounding district. At this elevation, window detailed design, trim and durability are more important than purity of historic materials (i.e. wood).

The painting of the façade is less of an issue since the façade is already painted. According to the Design Guide, brick should not be painted, but when it already is, it should be maintained. Additional care should be taken if paint is removed in order to retain historic soft brick (i.e. no sand-blasting). Special care is also required for mortar (soft mortar only).

Staff believes that with adequate discussion about how the project will be done carefully, an approval can be granted with any conditions that are agreeable to the applicant and the Commission. For example, soldier course design, relief detail and surface care methods.
Windows

Windows are basically holes punched in the facade of a structure and as such they contribute heavily to the visual presentation of a building or even block. Window openings in 19th century structures were typically vertical in proportion. In structures of Greek Revival (or Federal) style, these may have the proportions of a “golden section” (approximately 5:8 or 1:1.618, roughly those of the McCullough Block). The proportions for Italianate Revival structures might be 1:3 (in both the Schlenck Block, building I and the Kyger Block, building II) or even 1:5 (also in the Kyger Block). The predominant window for residential structures in the historic districts is 1 to 1, double hung, wood.

Insensitive window alteration has resized the window opening while leaving the original lintel and filling in the gap with a poor masonry treatment.

Maintenance and Preservation

1. Restored or replaced windows should be proportionally vertical, where architecturally appropriate.

2. Original window materials, design, or hardware should be maintained and/or duplicated.

3. Storm windows are encouraged for their energy efficiency. They should correspond in appearance to the inner window so that they look like part of the building rather than appearing to be just stuck-on.

4. Sash appearance should complement the existing (or original, if appropriate) windows, especially if the windows are visible from a public way.

5. Stone lintels over windows which are new or currently exist should be left unpainted, while previously painted lintels can be stripped utilizing non-abrasive chemicals.

Specific Recommendations

1. Windows should be proportionally vertical.
WINDOWS

A coat of matching paint on a storm window and proper lintel maintenance can make the difference between a well maintained (right) and a poorly maintained (left) window opening.

2. It is acceptable to clearly divide wide openings with proportionally vertical windows, so long as the basic form of the window itself is clearly vertical.

3. Window openings themselves may have flat lintels, round-arched lintels, or segmental-arched lintels.

4. Reflective glass (such as blue or gold tinted glass) is prohibited.

5. Skylights can be added to increase the availability of natural light. These should generally be flat and unobtrusive (especially from any public ways).

6. All window openings, sash appearances, and materials should be consistent and architecturally appropriate to the building style.

7. Where practical, historical accuracy based on physical or photographic evidence should be maintained.

8. Original features such as cornerboards, brackets, hoodmolds, and other details should be preserved, repaired, and/or replaced. Removal of these elements detracts from the overall appearance and presentation of a structure and should not be removed.

9. Avoid adding excessive ornamentation to create a more historic look by utilizing details which are inaccurate or inappropriate to the building's style or time period.

10. Windows which are to be closed-off should not be removed and the hole filled in with some type of permanent material. Rather, the window should be maintained.

NO – In this example, the window openings have inappropriately been permanently filled with brick and the window glass removed.
Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission Application

The pre-application provides an opportunity for the designer and the Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission (HAPC) to discuss a proposal prior to the applicant expending significant time and money on design, survey and engineering. It only requires submission of preliminary or conceptual information. The Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) requires submission of detailed exterior plans. [Section 1331.06(a)]

Applicant Information

Attach a Letter of Agency if the Applicant is not the property owner.

Name *
Scott Webb, Architect

Mailing Address *
103 West Walnut Street

City, State & Zip Code *
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Telephone Number(s) *
523-3838

Email Address
scott@scottwebbarchitect.com

Location of Property *
28 West High Street

Name of Building *

Legal Description *
Parcel #H41000030000017

Type of Application

Select all that apply.

☐ Pre-Application (no fee) ☐ Certificate of Appropriateness ($50.00) ☐ Demolition of Historic Structure ($250.00)

Proposed Environmental Change(s)

Describe, in detail, all proposed exterior alterations for this property and attach drawings showing its relationship to the existing or planned surroundings. Consult Chapter 1331 of the Oxford Municipal Code, Historic & Architectural Preservation¹ and the Design Guidelines² to review the requirements for decisions regarding environmental changes and conditions for removal as well as standards for Commission decisions.

Installation of windows on the west facing elevation

Change of color on this face from the existing red to white; current red paint is failing and having a detrimental affect on the very old soft brick.
Required Documentation

Attach a current photograph of the subject of this application. Include drawings and diagrams showing its relationship to the existing or planned surroundings.

You may find information on the history of the building in the Walking Tour\textsuperscript{3} booklets and at the Smith Library of Regional History\textsuperscript{4} located in the Oxford Lane Library.

Fee

There is no fee for pre-application review. The fee for Certification of Appropriateness is $50.00 or $250.00 if classified as historic by a City-approved inventory. Write a check payable to City of Oxford. You may also pay in-person using Visa, MasterCard, and Discover.

For demolition requests, if the application is approved, posting of financial security for the re-use plan and mitigation fees for the demolition will be required as part of permits, per Section 1331.063(a)(3) and (4).

Sign and Date

Applicant Signature \textsuperscript{*} \\

Date \textsuperscript{*} \\

6/8/20

Submit Application, Plans and Documentation, and Fee

\textit{We will not accept incomplete applications and/or documentation. Applications are due 19 days before the meeting. You will receive a copy of the agenda a few days prior to the meeting. In order for your request to be reviewed, you must be present.}

Send or drop off this application with required documentation as attachments and a check for fee (if applicable) made payable to City of Oxford, to Community Development Director, 15 South College Avenue, Oxford, OH 45056.

Direct questions to the Community Development Department at (513) 524-5204.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
\textbf{For Staff Use Only} \hline
Fee Paid Date \textsuperscript{*} \hline
Receipt Number \textsuperscript{*} \hline
Date of HAPC Review \textsuperscript{*} \hline
Decision \textsuperscript{*} \hline
\textbf{Decision} \textsuperscript{*} \hline
\textbf{Accepted} \textsuperscript{*} \hline
\textbf{Rejected} \textsuperscript{*} \hline
Approval Signature \textsuperscript{*} \hline
Title \textsuperscript{*} \hline
Comments/Conditions \textsuperscript{*} \hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{1} Oxford Codified Ordinances: cityofoxford.org/fees
\textsuperscript{2} Design Guidelines: cityofoxford.org/hapc
\textsuperscript{3} Oxford Visitors Bureau: 14 West Park Place, Suite C; Oxford, OH 45056, (513) 523-8687, enjoyoxford.org
\textsuperscript{4} Smith Library of Regional History: 441 South Locust Street, Oxford, OH 45056, (513) 523-3035, ianepl.org
\end{footnotesize}
LETTER OF AGENCY

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that Scott Webb, Architect has permission to represent our interest with the City of Oxford’s Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission regarding the installation of upper story windows on the western elevation of 28 West High Street.

Thank you,

Signed: [Signature]  
Tom Kacachos  

Date: 6/16/2020
TO: Historic & Architectural Preservation Commission  
FROM: Sam Perry  
DATE: July 1, 2020  
MEETING: July 8, 2020  
SUBJECT: 101 W. Church Street  
APPLICANT: Norman Butt

Per Oxford Chapter 1152, the construction of a new principal building requires two meetings of the HAPC. In this case, the new principal building request is combined with the proposed demolition of a building that is designated as "Historic" in the inventory. This requires additional evidence to be submitted.

The case status is a Pre-Application, so no vote will be taken of the HAPC. However, the purpose of the Pre-Application is to provide feedback to the applicant so that the owner can determine if it is justifiable to proceed further or make changes. Typically, staff analysis is not provided with a pre-application. Due to the demolition aspect, some preliminary analysis is provided here. As noted in Mr. Butt's description, the mid-19th century building has been modified several times. Originally, it was built as a residence and then later converted to a funeral parlor. In 2006, a demolition and redevelopment proposal was denied by the HAPC. Since that time, the building has been used as student rental housing; until a fire damage event in January 2020. The fire revealed concerning electrical conditions that could persist if the building remains.

The submittal includes evidence that seeks to demonstrate compliance with the City's requirement for financial considerations in upgrading a structure in lieu of demolition. By code, the city can also make its own assessment to ensure that an unbiased perspective of looking at viable options is taken. This includes but is not limited to the retaining of another Building Cost & Re-Use Assessment. It is important to note that the code was not specifically written to address restorations from involuntary damage (i.e. fire). It was written to address the upgrading of out-of-date buildings. The intent is to retain history and architecture to an extent feasible.

Regarding the proposed four story structure, the feedback of the HAPC members will be key; due to the fact that there is little guidance for new principal building construction in the Design Guidelines. The applicant does provide a thorough code and design guide analysis to work from. Staff recommends that the discussion be focused on the two aspects: Demolition permission and New Construction design; so that the applicant/owner team can decide if/when to move forward to the next step, which would be a complete application for demolition and new construction approval. If limited feedback is provided, the applicant will likely submit the same information supplemented by additional materials detail with samples.
Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission Application

The pre-application provides an opportunity for the designer and the Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission (HAPC) to discuss a proposal prior to the applicant expending significant time and money on design, survey and engineering. It only requires submission of preliminary or conceptual information. The Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) requires submission of detailed exterior plans. [Section 1331.06(a)]

Applicant Information

Attach a Letter of Agency if the Applicant is not the property owner.

- **Name**: Norman D. Butt, AIA, LEED AP - The Architectural Group, Inc.
- **Mailing Address**: 135 N. Main Street
- **City, State & Zip Code**: Dayton, Ohio 45402
- **Telephone Number(s)**: 937-223-2500
- **Email Address**: buttn@tagult.com
- **Location of Property**: 101 West Church
- **Name of Building**: Dudley Properties (Smith Funeral Home per Uptown Historic District Inventory)
- **Legal Description**: Parcel ID: H4000008000264

Type of Application

Select all that apply.

- [ ] Pre-Application (no fee)
- [ ] Certificate of Appropriateness ($50.00)
- [x] Demolition of Historic Structure ($250.00)

Proposed Environmental Change(s)

Describe, in detail, all proposed exterior alterations for this property and attach drawings showing its relationship to the existing or planned surroundings. Consult Chapter 1331 of the Oxford Municipal Code, Historic & Architectural Preservation and the Design Guidelines to review the requirements for decisions regarding environmental changes and conditions for removal as well as standards for Commission decisions.

See attachments.
Required Documentation

Attach a current photograph of the subject of this application. Include drawings and diagrams showing its relationship to the existing or planned surroundings.

You may find information on the history of the building in the Walking Tour\(^2\) booklets and at the Smith Library of Regional History\(^4\) located in the Oxford Lane Library.

Fee

There is no fee for pre-application review. The fee for Certification of Appropriateness is $50.00 or $250.00 if classified as historic by a City-approved inventory. Write a check payable to City of Oxford. You may also pay in-person using Visa, MasterCard, and Discover.

For demolition requests, if the application is approved, posting of financial security for the re-use plan and mitigation fees for the demolition will be required as part of permits, per Section 1331.063(a)(3) and (4).

Sign and Date

Applicant Signature *

[Signature]

Date *

June 22, 2020

Submit Application, Plans and Documentation, and Fee

We will not accept incomplete applications and/or documentation. Applications are due 19 days before the meeting. You will receive a copy of the agenda a few days prior to the meeting. In order for your request to be reviewed, you must be present.

Send or drop off this application with required documentation as attachments and a check for fee (if applicable) made payable to City of Oxford, to Community Development Director, 15 South College Avenue, Oxford, OH 45056.

Direct questions to the Community Development Department at (513) 524-5204.

For Staff Use Only

Fee Paid Date *

Receipt Number *

Date of HAPC Review *

Decision *  (Circle One) Accepted Rejected

Approval Signature *

Title *

Comments/Conditions *

---

\(^1\) Oxford Codified Ordinances: cityofoxford.org/fees
\(^2\) Design Guidelines: cityofoxford.org/hapc
\(^3\) Oxford Visitors Bureau: 14 West Park Place, Suite C; Oxford, OH 45056, (513) 523-8687, enjoyoxford.org
\(^4\) Smith Library of Regional History: 441 South Locust Street, Oxford, OH 45056, (513) 523-3036, tanepi.org
LETTER OF AGENCY

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that Norman D. Butt, AIA, LEED AP, Principal, The Architectural Group, Inc. has permission to represent our interest with the City of Oxford and act on our behalf at Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission (HAPC) meetings related to a Certificate of Appropriateness regarding considerations of demolition and redevelopment of the rental residence at our property located at 101 West Church Street, Oxford, Ohio 45056.

Thank you,

Signed: [Signature of Owner]  Date: 6-22-20

Signed: [Signature of Owner]  Date: 6-22-20

(Property Owner/Name Printed)
(Company Name/Organization)
Church & Beech Street Redevelopment

A Submission for review by the Oxford Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission
Date: June 22, 2021

PROJECT NARRATIVE

This submission encompasses two items for review by the Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission in support of the granting of an approved Certificate of Appropriateness. The first is the proposed demolition of the existing rental residence at 101 W. Church St. The second item for consideration is the appropriateness of a new project on the site designed to positively influence the historic, architectural, social and business fabric of the Uptown Historic District. Included in this submission is a project narrative, which outlines the Owner’s justification for demolition of the existing building and the benefits of the proposed changes to the site.

In accordance with section 1152.08 CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Oxford, Ohio, we submit the following information for review related to the demolition of the existing structure at 101 W. Church St. and the property’s redevelopment.

◊ CONSIDERATION FOR DEMOLITION

As is the case with many historic structures specific events and changes in use result in modifications to the original character of a site and/or the building. These changes become embedded as part of the historic narrative of the building and can either support or diminish its historical legacy. Constructed sometime between 1839 and 1846 the residence was used to board students studying within the Oxford Community until it was converted in a funeral home in the 1920s. With its purchase by the Dudley's in 2004 it was returned to its original use to house students. Unfortunately, during the period when used as a funeral home, exterior additions and interior modifications negatively affected the building’s Federalist character both aesthetically and structurally. As is evident in the attached “Existing Building Additions” and Butler County property roll documents, five separate and distinct additions totaling 4,663 square feet occurred to the original 1,027 square feet historic residence.

While the original structure has an architectural character consistent with the surrounding district, the numerous carport, porch, and utility space additions do not share the same attention to detail. Interiorly all remnants of the original historic structure were removed during the funeral home’s occupancy to be used for public viewing and services; with all restrooms and kitchen services relocated to other areas via new additions. When purchased by the Dudleys a study was performed to identify structural and deferred maintenance issues. Since that time, at considerable expense, the Dudley’s have made improvements to the building to support its maintenance and render it in compliance with current building code and safety standards.

It is the events of January 27, 2020 that initiated the consideration to raze the existing building related in part to future occupancy safety concerns. On that date, the City of Oxford’s Fire Department was dispatched to address a fire at the student rental residence which engaged the northern historic portion of the building where bedroom and living room areas were located. With no injury’s occurring and students relocated by the Dudley’s to other housing locations, a subsequent investigation found that the fire was not caused by neglect or inadvertent accident, but wiring within the original historic building’s walls. Due to this concealed condition, it was evident that restoration would require removal of existing plaster wall and ceiling surface to replace all knob-and-tube wiring. See attached post-fire photos of impacted areas.

In an effort to determine the extent of the damage an independent general contractor was contacted to visit the residence, assess the damage and prepare a proposal for the restoration of the residence. Ferguson Construction Company, Inc. (FCC) was selected due to their familiarity of working with historic structures.
and Miami University, specifically in collaboration with The Architectural Group on the exterior renovation and upgrades to Lewis Place, the residence of Miami University’s President. Their proposal is attached for review. An analysis of costs is as below:

Butler County Recorder’s Office:
Existing Land Value: $111,500
Existing Building Value: $293,440 ($51.66/SF)
Total Existing Value: $404,940

Ferguson Construction Restoration Proposal: $218,267 (represents 74.4% of building value)
Note: FCC’s restoration cost addresses only the damaged original interior historic area that was of 1,027 SF out of the building’s total 5,680 SF. With the building’s current value at $51.66/SF, the historic portion translates to an existing value of $105,525.95 (1,027 SF x $51.66/SF); consequently, the restoration cost actually represents approximately 206.8% of the original historic portion of the existing building.

Demolition Approval Criteria:
Per 1152.08 CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS the criteria for demolition requires that the applicant “demonstrate that the costs to rehabilitate or renovate the structure to a purposeful use exceeds 50 percent of the fair market value.”

Based upon the above information, we request approval to raze the existing structure. Since the damage that occurred was not done through neglect and since substantial reconstruction would be required beyond the 50 percent restore threshold, consideration is warranted for the building’s removal. Additionally, the Fire Department has expressed concern that the concealed wiring in the historic structure poses a public life safety threat if it remained.

It should be noted that this conclusion was not derived without considerable deliberation of alternatives to razing the structure. Future development around the structure would still mean that the residence would have to be addressed at considerable cost or left vacant. Incorporating the structure into a new development to maintain the original historic character would only be reflected in its shell and would inevitably be subverted by the scale of adjacent development. Also, removal of the additions would result in considerable reconfiguration of the original historic structure since the structural integrity of the original south wall has been compromised.

PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT & COMPLIANCES

The proposed reuse of the property has tremendous potential to benefit Oxford’s Uptown District and contribute as a historically referenced building mediating between the Uptown District’s four story structures and adjacent commercial and residential properties. The intent of the design is to meet all Ohio Building Code compliance requirements and those of the City of Oxford’s Zoning Code while taking into consideration and implementing suggestions from The Design Guidelines for the City’ of Oxford’s Historic Districts.

The development will be in compliance with the required Beech and Church Street front yard setbacks of a minimum of 16.5 feet. It should be noted that the required side and backyard setbacks are 0 feet and the new development will not encroach on this. These setbacks contribute to the possible development of approximately 73,600 square feet of leasable floor area. The 1st Floor would consist of retail, restaurant, and office type space with the upper levels dedicated to apartment housing. The composition of the housing is intended to be primarily for graduate students, faculty, professionals and others within direct walking distance to the Uptown District and the University. Though the Uptown District does not require parking to be provided as part of the development the design direction is to include approximately 50 below
grade spaces so as not to create additional burden on Uptown parking. Also under consideration is possible modification of the existing Beech Street parallel parking and the possibility of angled parking similar to that located in front of the Bike Shop. Final determination of this recommended change will be based upon discussions and coordination with the City of Oxford Planning and Engineering Departments.

Development Compatibility Considerations:

A. General Design, Character and Appropriateness:

Entries to ground level commercial businesses will be enhanced by plaza like public spaces within the 16.5' setback and supported by landscaping and potential seat benches. The 4' site elevation drop from the southwest alley intersection to the Beech/Church sidewalk requires attention to continuous access by all pedestrians at ADA accessible convenience. This grade differential also presents the opportunity to develop fencing barriers that reuse and possibly replicate existing historic site fencing as seen below and as indicated on the attached drawings and rendering.

B. Scale:

The overall four storey building height is anticipated to be approximately 43' that falls below the Zoning Code's 48' maximum height requirement, but visually reduces its height to more readily relate to adjacent lower height buildings by incorporating fourth story residences within slope roof areas with dormer windows. As is indicated on our elevation drawings the height of the proposed development is consistent with the height of the adjacent property to the south at 10 Beech. Also evident on the Church Street elevation, the first three stories of the proposed development relate to the overall height of the historic Johnston Prather House at 117 W. Church.

The proposed height of the 1st Floor commercial area is approximately 12' and is consistent with the heights of other historic buildings noted in the Guidelines in section E. Street-level: Height of Base of between 10.5' and 14.5'. The proposed building also is vertically organized similar to other buildings in the historic district by having a base, a body and a continuous cornice unifying the visually separated vertical elevation components. The cornice contains repetitive decorative molding that further reinforces this unification and references other historic structures.

The exterior elevations are organized parallel to each street as multiple components of proportionally vertical elements enhanced by pilasters and vertically aligned windows. The commercial storefronts are aligned with modular bays with some variation between major building structures.

The 2nd and the 3rd Floor upper story facades exhibit repetitive windows resulting in a balance of solid and void. The Church Street elevations consists of 18.5% perforations for windows while the Beech Street facade consists of 20.5% windows which falls within the recommendation of the Guidelines of between 10 and 40% of the upper story street facades.
C. Adjacency Similarity – Texture, Material & Color

The facades have been specifically developed with masonry extending two stories vertically to mimic the material on the existing building and other adjacent historic structures. Continuity of the facades is further enhanced by horizontal projections of masonry header courses to define floor levels and visually activate the texture of the facades. The 3rd story and the 4th story dormers are designed with painted horizontal siding to relate to a more residential character of buildings in the area and residences to the north. As mentioned previously the heavier cornice and friezes with continuous repetitive moldings tie the facades together. The upper levels of the façades are highlighted with metal railing projections adding detailing and provide vertical and horizontal rhythm. These railings are purposeful for greater tenant street-front involvement and visually unify the overall façade by reflecting the repurposed historic ground level fencing.

D. Visual Compatibility

As noted in descriptions above and below.

E. Historic, Architectural Features of Significance

In addition to the noted architectural characteristics, other design elements follow the Guidelines recommendations for development within the historic Uptown district. The roofs will be a combination of flat and asphalt shingle-sloped roofs with the major entries accentuated with flat roof parapets. The pitch of the sloped roofs exceeds the minimum pitch ratio of 6 to 12 and is currently set at 10 to 12.

The entrances at the ground level are designed to differentiate entrance into the upper residential level separate from ground level commercial entrances. The commercial entrance consist primarily of glass with a definitive protected masonry base below upper expanses of continuous glass windows. Upper level residential windows are double-hung operation types with their proportions exactly matching those of the existing building. The 1st Floor window/door opening head conditions will have stone or masonry headers, while the 2nd Floor will have individual extended height wood detailed headers, and the third floor will have arched clerestory type windows with smaller radius head trim. As is evident in the elevations and on the rendering masonry wall areas are available to add wall mounted signage with internal or concealed lighting.

Regarding paint colors, the current intent is represented in the attached rendering and shows a direction toward earth tones consistent with buildings in the Uptown District. No more than three color tones is anticipated with the wood trim accent elements enhancing the masonry tones.

On behalf of Terry and Kathy Dudley and Dudley Prime Properties, we thank you for the opportunity to present this information and look forward to the July HAPC meeting. As noted, we herein request approval to raze the existing structure and be granted an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the property to be develop in a historically reflective manner that we believe will be of great value to the Oxford Community.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Norman D. Butt, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Principal
The Architectural Group, Inc.
Land sizes for most platted subdivision lots are calculated using a front foot method; a formula which is designed to provide equity in assessed value. As a result, please note that the calculated acreage of an irregular shaped lot may not represent actual surveyed acreage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Building</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 - 11: OPEN FRAME PORCH</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 - 13/20: FRAME GARAGE/MASONRY</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 - 20: MASONRY</td>
<td>1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 - 30: OPEN CARPORT</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 - 11: OPEN FRAME PORCH</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARID: H4000008000264
DUDLEY TERRY &

101 W CHURCH ST

Parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Id</th>
<th>H4000008000264</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>101 W CHURCH ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/Unit #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Code</td>
<td>520, R - TWO FAMILY DWELLING, PLATTED LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>0001A016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>.6260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxing District</td>
<td>H40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Name</td>
<td>CINCINNATI TWP O CORP-C L/TWND CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Tax Rate</td>
<td>75.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Tax Rate</td>
<td>46.049527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Business Credit</td>
<td>.092551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Credit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwelling

| Stories               | 2              |
| Gross Living Area     | 5,680          |
| Construction          | BRICK          |
| Total Rooms           | 12             |
| Bedrooms              | 8              |
| Year Built            | 1895           |
| Finished Basement     | 0              |

Current Value

| Land (100%)           | $111,500       |
| Building (100%)       | $293,440       |
| Total Value (100%)    | $404,940       |
| CAUV                  | $0             |
| Assessed Tax Year     | 2019           |
| Land (35%)            | $39,030        |
| Building (35%)        | $102,700       |
| Assessed Total (35%)  | $141,730       |

Incentive District Parcels What is this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel identifier</th>
<th>Value Type</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4000008000264</td>
<td>Base Parcel</td>
<td>404,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homestead Credits How do I qualify?

| Homestead Exemption   | NO          |
| Owner Occupied Credit | NO          |
| 100% Disabled Veteran Exemption | NO |

CAUV & Agricultural District What is this?

| CAUV          | NO          |
| Agricultural District | NO |

Current Year Real Estate Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX TYPE</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>First Half Tax</th>
<th>Second Half Tax</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,961.28</td>
<td>2,961.28</td>
<td>5,922.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Payments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-2,961.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-2,961.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,961.28</td>
<td>2,961.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Owner and Legal Future?

| Owner 1           | DUDLEY TERRY & |
| Owner 2           | KATHERINE S    |
| Legal 1           | 3883 ENX       |
| Legal 2           |                |
**Taxbill Mailing Address** Can I change my mailing address?

| Mailing Name 1                  | TERRY & KATHERINE S DUDLEY |
| Mailing Name 2                  |                            |
| Address 1                       | 6744 CONTRERAS RD          |
| Address 2                       | OXFORD OH 45056 9739       |

**Transfers (Date represents time of transfer)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sale Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-DEC-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-MAR-04</td>
<td>$390,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-NOV-96</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transfers (Date represents time of transfer)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sale Amount</th>
<th>Trans #</th>
<th>Seller</th>
<th>Buyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-DEC-16</td>
<td>LAND &amp; BUILDING</td>
<td>$390,500.00</td>
<td>12064</td>
<td>DUDLEY TERRY &amp;</td>
<td>DUDLEY TERRY &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-MAR-04</td>
<td>LAND &amp; BUILDING</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2283</td>
<td>OGLE HARRY W TR</td>
<td>OGLE HARRY W TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-NOV-96</td>
<td>LAND &amp; BUILDING</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
<td>-4381</td>
<td>OGLE HARRY W</td>
<td>OGLE HARRY W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-MAY-85</td>
<td>LAND &amp; BUILDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building**

- Card: 1
- Stories: 2
- Construction: BRICK
- Style: STUDENT HOUSING
- Gross Living Area: 5,680
- Basement: PART
- Rec Room: NONE
- Physical Condition: NONE
- Attic: 1895
- Year Built: 1895
- Effective Year: 1895
- Year Remodeled: 1895
- Total Rooms: 12
- Bedrooms: 8
- Full Baths: 4
- Half Baths: 0
- Family Rooms: 1
- Additional Fixtures: 4
- Unfinished Area: 0
- Finished Basement: 0
- WBFP Stacks: 0
- Fireplace Openings: 0
- Prefab Fireplace: BASIC
- Heat System: GAS
- Fuel Type: SAME
- Int vs Ext Condition: SAME
- Miscellaneous: SAME

**Factors**

- Topography 1: LEVEL
- Topography 2: LEVEL
- Topography 3: LEVEL
- Utility 1: ALL PUBLIC
- Utility 2: NONE
- Utility 3: NONE
- Traffic 1: MEDIUM
- Fronting: MEDIUM

**Land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Front actual</th>
<th>Front effective</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>183.4</td>
<td>187.28</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>27,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 19, 2020

Dudley Prime Properties
6744 Contreras Road
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Attention: Terry & Kathy Dudley

Re: FCC Budget No.: 20-D0127

Mr. & Mrs. Dudley:

We are pleased to provide our budgetary proposal for the rehabilitation of 101 Church Street, Oxford, Ohio.

For the sum of . . . $ 218,267.00

The following work is included:

1. Conduct preliminary design meetings.
2. An allowance has been included for permit ready architectural, structural engineering, and electrical engineering documents.
3. An allowance of $1,500 has been included for purchasing a building permit.
4. Provide jobsite office trailer for owner, architect, and contractor meeting.
5. Provide full time supervision for the duration of the project.
6. Remove and dispose of the existing debris and furniture at the residence.
7. Provide and install temporary dehumidification equipment through out the space.
8. Remove and dispose of all ceiling structures in the Historical portion of the structure totaling approximately 2,000 square feet.
9. Remove and dispose of all the remaining carpet in the front, Historical portion of the home.
10. Remove and dispose of the burnt section of the rafters in the upstairs bedroom.
11. Remove and dispose of the existing electrical devices and light fixtures and associated wiring.
12. Provide and install replacement lumber section where rafter was were removed.
13. Provide and install framing for new drywall ceilings in the front, historical portion of the structure. The remaining space shall remain as it is.
14. Pull new MC cable to the locations of the existing electrical devices including light switches, outlets and light fixtures in the front, historical portion of the structure. It has been assumed that all other areas have a safe electrical system that shall remain in place.
15. Hang and finish approximately 2,000 square feet of drywall ceiling that was previously removed.
16. Complete general, minor touch up patching to the walls through out the structure in preparation for paint.
17. Paint all walls and ceilings though out the structure with the exception of the garage and the unfinished space toward the back of the property.
18. Provide and install broadloom carpet two bedrooms upstairs bedrooms in the front, historical portion of the structure.
19. Provide and install new electrical devices including outlets, switches, and light fixtures.
20. Clean up of all construction debris.

Notes & Clarifications:

1. This proposal is based upon a standard wage, first shift, forty (40) hour workweek.
2. This proposal has been created strictly for budgetary purposes considering the nature of the project.
3. Testing and removal of potentially hazardous materials has been specifically excluded from this proposal.
4. It has been assumed that the existing structure and systems comply with current building codes.
5. Prior to start of work, confirmed scope, drawings, financing information and payment term shall be verified.

We sincerely appreciate the opportunity of submitting our proposal and look forward to serving you on this project. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call our office.

Yours truly,

FERGUSON CONSTRUCTION COMPANY

Austin Dicke
Project Manager, Special Projects
Per Oxford Chapter 1152, any new construction that is visible, such as the proposed ‘skydeck’ alteration requires a Certificate of Appropriateness from the HAPC.

The current covered patio structure was approved by the HAPC and BZA in 2002/04.

The proposed change would extend the covering up another level and closer to High Street one additional pier “bay”.

The subject building was built in 1939 as a theater and is categorized as “Historic” in the 2018 inventory. It is labelled as Art Moderne architecture. There were modifications in the 1990s and 2000s. Further expansion of the patio structure also requires BZA approval. However, the HAPC has a duty to respond to the COA application, regardless of the BZA outcome.

The only related topics in the Design Guidelines are general in nature: Storefronts, Awnings, Streetscape and Upper Facades.

Because of the prominence of the building and it’s documented potential for theater façade restoration, the job of the HAPC is to determine if the expanded ‘skydeck’ takes away any further from the building or the district than the current structure already does. Essentially, is it insignificant enough to be separated from the historic façade and its surroundings? If so, than an approval can be rendered. By Code, the HAPC has 60 days to render a decision. The decision should only be delayed if it is documented that additional information is needed.
Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission Application

The pre-application provides an opportunity for the designer and the Historic and Architectural Preservation Commission (HAPC) to discuss a proposal prior to the applicant expanding significant time and money on design, survey and engineering. It only requires submission of preliminary or conceptual information. The Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) requires submission of detailed exterior plans. (Section 1331.06(a))

Applicant Information

* Attach a Letter of Agency if the Applicant is not the property owner.

Name *) Mark Weisman
Mailing Address *) 6337 Carriage Oak Way
City, State & Zip Code *) Liberty Twp, Ohio, 45011
Telephone Number(s) *) 513-255-2851
Email Address
Location of Property *) 36 East High St
Name of Building *) Brick St Bar
Legal Description *) Restaurant / Cafe / Bar

Type of Application

Select all that apply.

☐ Pre-Application (no fee)  ☐ Certificate of Appropriateness ($50.00)  ☐ Demolition of Historic Structure ($250.00)

Proposed Environmental Change(s)

Describe, in detail, all proposed exterior alterations for this property and attach drawings showing its relationship to the existing or planned surroundings. Consult Chapter 1331 of the Oxford Municipal Code, Historic & Architectural Preservation¹ and the Design Guidelines² to review the requirements for decisions regarding environmental changes and conditions for removal as well as standards for Commission decisions.

Existing patio roof to be removed, existing steel reconfigured and reinstalled to create structure for new second floor Skydeck. Skydeck to be open air and not covered with a roof. Design is to extend existing cmu block architecture up to Skydeck to maintain consistency and to allow solid structure to connect the new railing to.

HAPC-application
Required Documentation

Attach a current photograph of the subject of this application. Include drawings and diagrams showing its relationship to the existing or planned surroundings.

You may find information on the history of the building in the Walking Tour booklet and at the Smith Library of Regional History located in the Oxford Lane Library.

Fee

There is no fee for pre-application review. The fee for Certification of Appropriateness is $50.00 or $250.00 if classified as historic by a City-approved inventory. Write a check payable to City of Oxford. You may also pay in-person using Visa, MasterCard, and Discover.

For demolition requests, if the application is approved, posting of financial security for the re-use plan and mitigation fees for the demolition will be required as part of permits, per Section 1331.063(a)(3) and (4).

Sign and Date

Applicant Signature *

Date *

Submit Application, Plans and Documentation, and Fee

We will not accept incomplete applications and/or documentation. Applications are due 19 days before the meeting. You will receive a copy of the agenda a few days prior to the meeting. In order for your request to be reviewed, you must be present.

Send or drop off this application with required documentation as attachments and a check for fee (if applicable) made payable to City of Oxford, to Community Development Director, 15 South College Avenue, Oxford, OH 45056.

Direct questions to the Community Development Department at (513) 524-5204.

For Staff Use Only

Fee Paid Date *

Receipt Number *

Date of HAPC Review *

Decision * (Circle One) Accepted Rejected

Approval Signature *

Title *

Comments/Conditions *

---

1 Oxford Codified Ordinances: cityofoxford.org/fees
2 Design Guidelines: cityofoxford.org/hapc
3 Oxford Visitors Bureau: 14 West Park Place, Suite C; Oxford, OH 45056, (513) 523-8687, enjoyoxford.org
4 Smith Library of Regional History: 441 South Locust Street, Oxford, OH 45056, (513) 523-3035, lanepi.org

Last Revised: Monday, January 14, 2019