



**Minutes  
July 15, 2021**

The City of Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission Standards Sub-Committee met in a special session at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, July 15, 2021, at 217 South Main Street in the Council Chamber.

**Present:** Steve Cobb, Will James, Marcelo Menza, Jon Planovsky.

**Staff Present:** Hannah Jacobson, Emily Vanek.

**PRESENTATION**

Emily Vanek opened the meeting with an introduction of the four standards to be updated:

1. Hardie board
2. Roofing material
3. Composite flooring
4. Windows

For each item, staff reviewed comparable Standards from Charlotte, Wilmington and Durham.

*Composite Flooring*

Ms. Vanek shared Durham's Standard for contributing properties:

"When historic porches, stoops or balconies are deteriorated beyond repair, reconstruct these elements to match the design, size and pattern of the original element. Select replacement materials to match the appearance of the historic materials."

The Committee discussed the durability of various qualities of wood vs. composite. Steve Cobb brought an example of high quality composite for the group to inspect. An unfinished style of this material is being used for a porch currently under construction. The material had been previously approved by the HPC under mitigating circumstances.

The Committee was divided regarding the approval for use of composite, as even a high quality, unfinished style can look and feel like plastic. The Committee noted that it would be difficult to discern the difference from the street

Hannah Jacobson reminded the Committee that they have approved these materials in the past under specific circumstances, for outbuildings and when used on a non-character defining elevation.

The discussion centered on the difference between requiring materials to stay architecturally authentic and the affordability of composite materials. The Committee considered allowing a composite product if it could be stained, painted, or varnished. Staff will research various brands of composite and bring in samples for the next meeting.

### *Window Replacement*

Mr. Cobb raised the merits of true divided light windows versus simulated divided light for discussion. The Committee agreed to keep the Standard requiring true divided light windows for replacements.

Ms. Jacobson mentioned that she feels the most challenging cases involving windows are those where modifications had been made over time. It has been the practice that when any changes to those windows are proposed, the Commission requires the installation of wood windows that would match the historic character of the structure. Mr. Cobb mentioned that this is inconsistent with how roofing material is addressed. The Committee discussed that if vinyl or other like-for-like replacements were allowed, then there must be a time limitation such as if the change was made prior to the adoption of the district.

The Committee agreed to add a standard that encouraged original windows from non-character defining elevations to be moved to the front façade, in the event a window had to be replaced. Replacement on the non-character defining façade would have to be like-for-like (i.e. wood in most instances in the correct panel division).

After a discussion of current Standards as compared to the examples from other cities, the Committee agreed that the wording in Wilmington's example was acceptable, especially the use of the word, "appropriate."

Wilmington's Standard:

"If a window or door has deteriorated beyond repair, the replacement should match the original in size, proportion, material and detail. Vinyl-clad windows are not appropriate in the historic districts."

### *Roofing Material*

Ms. Vanek displayed Durham's standard for contributing properties. It allows for two different types of material, as long as character-defining materials are used in the front.

During the discussion regarding replacement of economy materials, the Committee agreed that each case should be considered individually. They preferred the wording in Durham's standard, quoted below. There was disagreement in using different materials on the same roof. The Committee agreed to interpret the wording in Durham's standard "Material may be consolidated and used..." as using similar as opposed to different material.

Durham's Standards:

- “With the exception of asphalt shingles, retain and repair original roof material. Material may be consolidated and used on street-facing or character-defining elevations.
- Retain slate, tile and other character-defining roof materials on structures where these materials were original. Replacement simulated materials may be used so long as they closely match the design in shape, size, color, exposure and texture of the original material.
- Select replacement roof materials from historic roof materials found in the district.
- Modern roof materials may be used on flat roofs where they are not visible from the adjacent right-of-way.
- Select modern metal roof materials that match historic metal profiles.”

*Hardie Board*

HPC guidelines already suggest considering Hardie board on a case by case basis if another material is not available. The Committee discussed when and why Hardie board would be used, and agreed that maintenance cost of natural wood should not be a reason to replace it with Hardie board.

The Committee suggested to adding to 3.1.10 that Hardie board could be considered if only used in a portion of the house and never on the front façade. The Standard would also require proper maintenance. The Hardie board would need to match the existing siding in appearance.

The Committee agreed to allow Hardie board for new construction, as long as the scale and thickness is consistent with the design.

A discussion of Standard 5.4.4, which requires that additions should be visually different from the original design of the main structure underscored its' confusing language. The Committee's interpretation of the Standard is that it wants to ensure the addition isn't portrayed as historic. Since 5.4.5 reads that additions should be compatible, the Committee suggested 5.4.4 be deleted and 5.4.5 remain.

**FUTURE STANDARDS TO REVIEW**

Ms. Vanek suggested paint color standards be reviewed. Currently, they are not listed as Standards in Chapter 3.9.; They are simply suggestions. She added that Downtown does not have suggestions relating to color. The Committee agreed to add color suggestions to the Standards. .

After the Bell Tower Green meeting on July 26, the Committee will review Lighting Chapter 4.3.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:24 p.m.