The City is operating under a State of Emergency declaration related to the spread of COVID-19. The City Council meeting will be held electronically to remain consistent with limiting physical interactions and the potential spread of COVID-19, and Council Chambers will be closed. The meeting will be streamed live at salisburync.gov/webcast and on the City’s Twitter account. Anyone who wishes to speak during public comment must sign-up by 5:00 p.m. on January 19, 2021 by contacting Kelly Baker at kbake@salisburync.gov or 704-638-5233.

1. Call to order.
3. Pledge of Allegiance.
4. Adoption of Agenda.

5. Mayor to proclaim the following observances:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observance</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury School Choice Week</td>
<td>January 24–30, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Schools Week</td>
<td>January 31 – February 6, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Slavery and Human Trafficking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Month</td>
<td>January 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Council to consider the CONSENT AGENDA:

   (a) Adopt Minutes of the Regular meeting of January 5, 2021.

   (b) Approve a Right-of-Way Encroachment by Spectrum for the installation of directional bored duct on Lash Drive per Section 11-24 (27) of the City Code.

   (c) Adopt a budget ORDINANCE Amendment to the FY2020-2021 budget in the amount of $1,155 to appropriate donations received for the Share2Care Fund.

   (d) Adopt a RESOLUTION accepting an offer of dedication for the right-of-way and adopt an ORDER to close a portion of an alley in the 800 block of West Cemetery Street, subject to utility easements. A presentation and public hearing were held during Council’s January 5, 2021 meeting and no additional comments were received.

7. Council to receive public comment. Public comment will begin following adoption of the Consent Agenda. For electronic meetings speakers must sign-up before 5:00 p.m. by contacting Kelly Baker at kbake@salisburync.gov or by calling 704-638-5233. Citizens who are unable to speak during the meeting may submit written comments by 4:00 p.m. to the email above and they will be shared with Council.
8. Council to consider adopting an ORDINANCE designating the “Moore House” located at 124 South Ellis Street as a Local Historic Landmark: (Presenter – Senior Planner Catherine Garner)

(a) Receive a presentation from staff
(b) Hold a public hearing
(c) Comments regarding the proposed designation will be accepted for 24 hours from the close of the public hearing. Action cannot be taken until the end of the 24 hour period.

9. Council to consider adopting an ORDINANCE designating the “Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House” located at 619 South Main Street as a Local Historic Landmark: (Presenter – Senior Planner Catherine Garner)

(a) Receive a presentation from staff
(b) Hold a public hearing
(c) Comments regarding the proposed designation will be accepted for 24 hours from the close of the public hearing. Action cannot be taken until the end of the 24 hour period.

10. Council to consider a recommendation regarding eligibility for listing the “Edgar S. and Madge Temple House” located at 1604 Statesville Boulevard in the National Register of Historic Places: (Presenter – Senior Planner Catherine Garner)

(a) Receive a presentation from staff
(b) Hold a public hearing
(c) Comments regarding the proposed recommendation will be accepted for 24 hours from the close of the public hearing. Action cannot be taken until the end of the 24 hour period.


12. Council to consider adoption of an amendment to the FY2020-2021 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Action Plan regarding the use of use of CDBG funding to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the Coronavirus (CDBG-CV) through the CARES Act. Presenters – Community Planning Services Director Hannah Jacobson and Housing Planner Candace Edwards)

13. Council to consider Land Development District Map Amendment Z-01-2020 to rezone one parcel (060 190) on the south side of South Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue from Corridor Mixed Use (CMX) and Highway Business (HB) to Highway Business: (Presenter – Senior Planner Catherine Garner)

14. Council to consider Land Development District Map Amendment Z-02-2020 to rezone one parcel (015 537) located at 725 South Main street from Highway Business (HB) to Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX): (Presenter – Senior Planner Catherine Garner)

15. City Attorney’s Report.

17. Council’s Comments.

18. Mayor Pro Tem’s Comments.

19. Mayor’s Announcements and Comments:

(a) The public is invited to provide feedback on the proposed Downtown Main Street Plan. The plan will be presented virtually to the Neighborhood Leaders Alliance on January 21, 2021 at 4:00 p.m. and at a Main Street meeting January 27, 2021 at 6:00 p.m. Meetings will be held outdoors and in person on January 22, 2021 at 8:00 a.m. in front of Koco Java located at 329 North Main Street, and January 22, 2021 at 11:30 a.m. in front of the Wells Fargo Building located at 231 South Main Street. For Zoom meeting links and to view the draft plan please visit www.salisburync.gov/mainstplan

20. Adjourn.
REGULAR MEETING

PRESENT: Mayor Karen K. Alexander, Presiding; Mayor Pro Tem Al Heggins, Council Members William Brian Miller, David Post and Tamara Sheffield; City Manager W. Lane Bailey, City Clerk Kelly Baker; and City Attorney J. Graham Corriher.

ABSENT: None.

In response to the State of Emergency declaration related to the spread of COVID-19 and to limit physical interactions and the potential spread of COVID-19 the Salisbury City Council met electronically. The meeting was called to order by Mayor Alexander at 6:00 p.m. A moment of silence was taken.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Alexander led participants in the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States flag.

RECOGNITION OF VIEWERS

Mayor Alexander welcomed all viewers.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Mayor Alexander noted the following changes to the Agenda;

Remove – Agenda Item 6e - Approve the retirement of Police K-9 Arnie and gifting the dog to his handler Officer James Hampton.

.
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Thereupon, Councilmember Post made a motion to adopt the Agenda with presented changes. Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Mayor Pro Tem voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted AYE, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (5-0)

PROCLAMATIONS

Mayor Alexander proclaimed the following observances:

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DAY January 18, 2021
NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH January 2021

CONSENT AGENDA

(a) Minutes

Adopt Minutes of the Regular meeting of December 1, 2020.

(b) Budget Ordinance Amendment- Tennis and Pickleball Court Resurfacing

Adopt an Ordinance amending the FY2020-2021 budget in the amount of $25,000 to appropriate donations received for the completion of the tennis and pickleball court resurfacing project.

ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2020-2021 BUDGET ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA TO APPROPRIATE DONATIONS IN GENERAL FUND FOR PARKS AND RECREATION.

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 30 at Page No. 1, and is known as Ordinance 2021-01.)

(c) 2021 Council Meeting Schedule

Adopt the 2021 meeting schedule for Council. The schedule includes one meeting for July, one meeting in December, an early start time for August 3 to allow Council to participate in National Night Out events, and the meeting for November 2 will be moved to Wednesday, November 3 to accommodate the election.
(d) **Ordinance Amendment- TA-02-2020**

Adopt an Ordinance amending the Land Development Ordinance (TA-02-2020) to amend Chapters 1, 2, 4, 9, 14, 15, 17 and 18 for compliance with North Carolina General Statute 160D and other legislative changes. A presentation and public hearing were held during Council’s December 1, 2020 meeting and no additional comments were received.

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTERS 1 (PURPOSE AND APPLICABILITY), 2 (DISTRICTS), 4 (SUBDIVISIONS AND INFRASTRUCTURE), 9 (ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS), 14 (AGENCIES, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS), 15 (DEVELOPMENT PROCESS), 17 (VIOLATIONS AND PENALTIES), AND 18 (DEFINITIONS) OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA RELATED TO ORDINANCE CONFORMANCE WITH NCGS 160D AND OTHER LEGISLATIVE CHANGES. (PETITION NO. LDOTA-02-2020)**

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 30 at Page No. 2-43, and is known as Ordinance 2021-02.)

Thereupon, Councilmember Sheffield made a **motion** to adopt the Consent Agenda with presented changes. Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Mayor Pro Tem Heggins voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted AYE, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (5-0)

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mayor Alexander opened the floor to receive public comments.

There being no one to address Council, Mayor Alexander closed the public comment session.

**ALLEY CLOSING- WEST CEMETERY STREET**

City Engineer Wendy Brindle noted on November 17, 2020 City Council adopted a Resolution of Intent to permanently close a portion of an alley, also known as Elite Street, located in the 800 block of West Cemetery Street. She presented a map and identified the portion of Elite Street that is proposed for permanent closure. She explained a public hearing regarding the closure was scheduled and advertised in accordance with North Carolina General Statute 160A-299. She added the closure is not contrary to the public interest. She reviewed the process for a closure and noted because the hearing is virtual, it requires a 24 hour comment period. She indicated she will come back to Council at its next meeting to request the adoption of a resolution and an order to close the alley.
b) Mayor Alexander convened a public hearing, after due notice thereof, to receive comments regarding the proposed closing of a portion of an alley in the 800 block of West Cemetery Street.

There being no one to address Council, Mayor Alexander closed the public hearing and indicated comments regarding the proposed closing will be accepted for 24 hours from the close of the public hearing. She noted questions regarding the closing can be directed to the City’s engineering office at (704) 638-5200 and comments can be emailed to the City Clerk at kbake@salisburync.gov.

**LAND DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT MAP AMENDMENT- Z-01-2020**

Senior Planner Catherine Garner indicated Land Development District Map Amendment Z-01-2020 regards an unnumbered parcel identified as Parcel 060190 located on South Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue. She stated Mr. Bill Wagner is an agent for Partners in Learning Child Development Center who has requested to convert the parcel that is split-zoned from Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX) and Highway Business (HB) to HB use only. She explained the parcel is vacant and located approximately 255 feet south of the intersection of Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue and Mooresville Road. She noted the parcel has no address and will be given an official address when plans are submitted to develop the site. She added the land is relatively flat and does not appear to have any environmental concerns.

Ms. Garner stated there are few changes in applicable uses in the zoning matrix between CMX and HB but the parcel will need to be rezoned for the development of a commercial child development center. She explained the rezoning will not be a conditional district rezoning and a specific site plan will not be tied to the site. She added the rezoning will make the parcel consistent with surrounding parcels which are zoned HB.

Ms. Garner indicated the rezoning is applicable to Vision 2020 statements regarding the demand for large scale commercial and institutional manufacturing facilities should be buffered from neighborhoods. She noted there are small residential neighborhoods within the vicinity of the parcel but it does not directly border neighborhoods and will not have an impact on residential use. She stated the rezoning is applicable to the neighborhood policy recommendation to locate major traffic generators on corners of neighborhood planning areas.

Ms. Garner indicated the Planning Board met on December 8, 2020 and voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rezoning. She noted Mr. Bill Wagner and Mr. Bill Burgin abstained from the vote because of their involvement in the project.

b) Mayor Alexander convened a public hearing, after due notice thereof, to receive comments regarding the proposed Land Development District Map Amendment Z-01-2020.

Mr. Bill Wagner stated he is involved with the Partners in Learning organization which has operated as a child development center for approximately 30 years. He explained the eight and one-half acre parcel is zoned for HB except for a small portion which is zoned CMX. He added
rezoning the entire parcel to HB will eliminate the challenges associated with developing an area with split zoning.

There being no one else to address Council, Mayor Alexander closed the public hearing and indicated comments regarding the proposed amendment will be accepted for 24 hours from the close of the public hearing. She noted questions regarding the amendment can be directed to Senior Planner Catherine Garner at (704) 638-5212 or (704) 638-5208 and comments can be emailed to the City Clerk at kbake@salisburync.gov.

**LAND DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT MAP AMENDMENT- Z-02-2020**

Senior Planner Catherine Garner indicated Land Development District Map Amendment Z-02-2020 regards Parcel 015537 located at 725 South Main Street. She noted the parcel is owned by Mr. Edward Clemmet who is requesting to rezone the property from Highway Business (HB) to Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX). She explained the site is developed and has a residential single family dwelling that has been recently used as commercial space. She added Mr. Clemmet would like the option to convert the home into a single-family residence or multi-family apartments which are not permitted under HB zoning requirements. She indicated rezoning the property to CMX will increase residential opportunities for the house.

Ms. Garner stated the proposed rezoning is applicable to Vision 2020 statements regarding historic preservation. She indicated the property is located in a historic area of the City but is not within a historic district.

Ms. Garner noted the Planning Board met on December 8, 2020 and voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rezoning. She indicated if anyone has questions regarding the rezoning she can be reached at (704) 638-5212 and written comments can be sent to the City Clerk.

b) Mayor Alexander convened a public hearing, after due notice thereof, to receive comments regarding the proposed Land Development District Map Amendment Z-02-2020.

Ms. Garner read emailed comments from Mr. Edward Clemmet indicating he purchased the house in early 2018 with the idea of rehabilitating it and preserving its history. He noted the historic architecture of the house is unique and preserving the house will add to the historic core of the City.

Councilmember Post expressed concerns regarding spot zoning. He stated the parcel will be surrounded by HB if the rezoning is approved. He noted zoning in areas surrounding the parcel should be examined.

Councilmember Miller asked if Business Mixed-Use (BMX) had been reviewed as a potential option for the area. Ms. Garner stated BMX had not been considered because of its rarity in the area.
Mayor Alexander indicated CMX and HB are similar regarding what is permitted. She stated CMX is a great option because it will permit single-family dwellings that can also be used for home-based businesses.

City Attorney Graham Corriher noted spot zoning concerns are understandable and the City has the option to determine whether current zoning is appropriate for the larger area.

Mr. Edward Clemmet joined the meeting and reiterated his need for the flexibility that CMX zoning will provide.

There being no one else to address Council, Mayor Alexander closed the public hearing. She indicated comments regarding the proposed amendment will be accepted for 24 hours from the close of the public hearing. She noted questions regarding the amendment can be directed to Senior Planner Catherine Garner at (704) 638-5212 or (704) 638-5208 and comments can be emailed to the City Clerk at kbake@salisburync.gov.

Councilmember Sheffield asked for a larger map of the area to be rezoned including the surrounding areas. She then asked why single family dwellings are excluded in HB zoning.

Ms. Garner indicated the proposed rezoning area and the surrounding areas can be examined to determine whether rezoning is necessary. She indicated she will provide Council with additional information regarding HB zoning and a larger map of the area.

**COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT (CAFR)**

Mr. CJ Palmer from Elliott Davis, PLLC stated he is thankful to the City for allowing him to provide audit services. He noted the City’s finance team was great to work with.

Mr. Palmer indicated he issued the City an unmodified opinion of the financial statements which is the highest level of assurance that can be provided. He added staff utilized statistical sampling and other sampling methods when testing. Mr. Palmer stated internal controls were reviewed as part of the audit procedure to gain an understanding of how the City works. He explained if a city has strong internal controls in place the risk assessment will be low but areas that have weak internal controls will have a high-risk assessment.

Mr. Palmer noted the audit includes a letter of representation to outline management’s responsibility for the financial statements and to confirm significant judgments. He indicated consultations between staff and management were typical with no significant issues or difficulties. He explained he is required to include significant deficiencies or material weaknesses in the audit report. He added there was one finding on the deficit net position which is a repeat finding from the past several years. He explained the City is working through a broadband service fund deficit net position that is not in alignment with the state.
Mr. Palmer indicated City funds were relatively stable over the past year. He explained there was a budgeted use of the Fund Balance over the past year and there was an increase of $0.5 million which speaks to management and the City’s ability to control costs.

Mr. Palmer presented a chart showing the available Fund Balance as a percentage of expenditures and transfers to the General Fund. He noted the Fund Balance is significantly higher than the City policy. He reviewed General Fund revenues versus expenditures and transfers. He indicated the funds have remained similar each year. He explained revenues, expenditures, and personnel costs have increased but there are also capital items that make up some of the increase. He displayed a chart showing the details of revenue by source. He pointed out the largest revenue item is property tax followed by sales tax. He explained the data is relatively consistent and expected for a City of comparable size. He stated broadband services from Fibrant are on an accrual basis and include appreciation and operating expenses. He pointed out the City has a deficit net position which can be viewed as an increase in net position from approximately a $10 million deficit to a $5 million deficit.

Mr. Palmer indicated Water and Sewer, Stormwater, and Transit Funds have experienced an increase in net position and have a positive net position. He noted the data for the funds is relatively consistent with prior years. He explained when viewing the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) the management discussion and analysis should be reviewed because it provides additional analysis of financial highlights, explanations of changes between years and economic outlooks. He added towards the end of the report there is trend information on multi-year periods that provides historic trends and data which can be helpful to citizens.

Councilmember Post stated North Carolina law requires the City to maintain a minimum 8% of the Fund Balance and the City has 32%. He explained it is important for the public to know that the City has four times the amount required by law. He asked about the City policy regarding the Fund Balance. Mr. Palmer indicated the City’s policy is 10%.

Councilmember Post asked about the Broadband Fund. He stated it is significant that operating losses have decreased from approximately $1 million to under $200,000. Mayor Alexander noted the Broadband Fund is trending in a positive direction.

Mayor Pro Tem Heggins asked if information regarding the different schedules will be available to the public. Mr. Palmer indicated the information will be available to the public within the City’s CAFR. Mr. Furches stated the CAFR will be posted to the City’s website.

Mayor Pro Tem Heggins asked if the public will have access to specific areas of the CAFR without reading the entire document. Mr. Furches indicated the complete CAFR will be posted to the website and citizens can access the transmittal letter, management discussion, and analysis sections for information regarding the highlights. He stated he will work with the Communications Department to develop a press release that will highlight key sections of the CAFR.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG-CV) FUNDING

Housing Planner Candace Edwards stated the City has received additional Community Development Block Grant (CDBG-CV) funds in response to COVID-19. She noted in September 2020 staff was notified of a second allocation in the amount of $200,221. She explained the first allocation was provided in the spring and summer of 2020 for $168,950. She added 100% of the first allocation was dedicated to public service agencies serving low-income individuals and families. She stated on December 1, 2020 a public hearing was held to gather input regarding the best and most urgent use of the second allocation of funds. She indicated she received additional public comment that will be shared with Council before its January 19, 2020 meeting. She stated staff is in the draft phase of the budget and action plan amendment for the funds. She explained a draft will be available for public viewing and comment from January 5, 2021 through January 12, 2021. She added the action plan amendment will be presented to Council at its January 19, 2021 meeting for consideration. She indicated once the plan is adopted the action plan amendment will be submitted to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for approval.

Ms. Edwards indicated there was $34,834 remaining from the first round of funding to be spent on public service activity. She noted the second round of funding has not been designated for specific use and may be spent on public services, housing activities, planning or economic development and infrastructure. She stated the total amount available is $235,055. She explained staff has developed recommendations for use of the funds to include public service agencies. She added staff would like to distribute a community wide advertisement to call for applications.

Ms. Edwards indicated $25,500 was awarded to Rowan Helping Ministries who is diligently helping families with rent and utilities. She explained the agency has received Hope Funds from the State and has spent approximately $1.3 million in Hope Funds to assist 400 families during the pandemic. She added with CDBG-CV funds, traditional funds, and Share 2 Care funds they have been able to assist an additional 58 families. She explained there will be a high demand for utility assistance due to the Governor’s continued moratorium on evictions through January 31, 2021. She added Rowan Helping Ministries receives approximately 100 applications each week for rent and utility assistance.

Ms. Edwards stated another recommendation is to assist with sewer and lateral line repair. She indicated the cost to transfer a private lateral line to the public sewer system is $1,975 and the cost to repair the line is approximately $500 to $700. She explained Salisbury-Rowan Utilities (SRU) and the Finance Department support funding for line services because a grant program is not available to assist low-income people who apply for these services. She added staff is recommending $10,000 be allocated to line assistance.

Ms. Edwards indicated staff recommends funds be used to assist with coordinating a strategy to address homelessness in the short and mid-term with a focus on prevention. She stated coordinated strategic planning can be used to help examine and address root causes of homelessness. She noted staff recommends $40,000 for this coordination. She added staff met with stakeholders who are willing to partner with the City regarding this effort.
Ms. Edwards pointed out another recommendation is to establish a Small Business Grant Program similar to the one created by Rowan County. She explained administration of the program could be costly. She added an additional idea for small business assistance is investment funds for the Kiva program. She indicated the recommendation for small business programs is $60,000.

Ms. Edwards stated there are two amendments to the FY2021 Action Plan. She explained staff is recommending that sidewalks on Ryan Street from Celebration Drive to Old Concord Road be prioritized in FY2021. She indicated the budget cost estimates for Lash Drive exceeded the available budget and Ryan Drive connects a low-income housing development to future sidewalk improvements on Old Concord Road. She stated there is a minor error in the HUD allocation that needs to be rectified and explained the impact of the error is less than $500.

Ms. Edwards noted a draft of the plan will be available online for the public to view until January 12, 2021. She indicated hard copies of the draft plan are also available. She stated for additional information or to submit comments she can be reached at (704) 638-5324 or at candace.edwards@salisburync.gov.

**RECESS**

By consensus, Council agreed to take a five-minute recess. The meeting reconvened at 7:50 p.m.

**ONE-WAY STREET- WEST HENDERSON STREET**

City Engineer Wendy Brindle indicated the request for a one-way street is related to the portion of West Henderson Street between Old Mocksville Road and Confederate Avenue. She pointed out the area is a small section of the street that is approximately 15 feet wide. She explained the concern is when vehicles are on the curved section of the street one of the vehicles has to drive off the pavement which can result in property damage or an accident. She added the street is posted as a no truck street to mitigate large trucks coming through the area. She explained staff has worked with the neighborhood since January 2019 to identify a solution. She added one solution was to widen the road in the curve but budget constraints and the potential to damage landscaping was overwhelming.

Ms. Brindle stated neighbors suggested posting do not enter signs at the end of the street at the entrance from Old Mocksville Road. She explained posting the signs will designate the area as one-way and allow the residents to travel through the exit and prevent traffic from the opposite direction from entering. She added petitions based on the number of parcels were circulated to gain feedback on posting the signs. She explained two parcels are owned by the same property owner and one is a separate owner. She added there were three parcels opposed and only two property owners. She indicated based on the petition process 75% are in favor based on parcels and 79% based on property owners.
Ms. Brindle stated based on the input received and the inability to quickly alleviate the width of the curve, staff recommends Council adopt an Ordinance to modify Section 13-329 of the City Code which would designate West Henderson street as one-way from Old Mocksville Road to a point approximately 130 feet East of Old Mocksville Road.

Thereupon, Councilmember Miller made a motion to adopt an Ordinance amending Chapter 13, Article X, of the Code of the City of Salisbury relating to one-way streets. Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Mayor Pro Tem voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted AYE, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (5-0)

ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 13, ARTICLE X, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, RELATING TO ONE-WAY STREETS.

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 30 at Page No. 44, and is known as Ordinance 2021-03.)

CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT

City Attorney Graham Corriher had nothing to report to Council.

CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

(a) Interlocal Agreement with Rowan County for tax collection

City Manager Lane Bailey requested Council consider adopting an Interlocal Agreement between Rowan County and the City of Salisbury for property tax collection services. He explained the County is formatting agreements with municipalities so they are uniform.

Mr. Bailey stated Council has discussed the possibility of adding Stormwater fee collections to tax bills rather than the monthly water bill. He indicated he has spoken with County staff and Council may vote on the matter separately if Stormwater collection is still an interest.

Thereupon, Mayor Pro Tem Heggins made a motion to adopt an Interlocal Agreement with Rowan County for tax collection. Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Mayor Pro Tem Heggins voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted AYE, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (5-0)

Mayor Alexander asked for Council’s comments regarding bill collection for Stormwater services. She indicated there is an option to continue to bill for services on a customer’s water bill which is due monthly or the City can have the County send customers a yearly bill with their tax bill.

Councilmember Miller asked if there will be a cost savings for using the County and if it will impact the budget. Mr. Bailey indicated the City will pay a percentage of the collection fees
for the tax which can potentially be offset by not filling a position. He stated staff will look into options to offset the collection fee but having the charge on a tax bill may yield a higher collection rate. Councilmember Miller stated he would like to see information regarding the cost impact of placing the charge on the tax bill.

Mayor Alexander asked if surveys can be completed to gain citizen feedback on the option they would prefer. Mr. Bailey indicated he will speak with Communications staff regarding survey and poll options.

Councilmember Post indicated if either option creates a break even cost benefit it may not be worth the trouble to change the billing.

Councilmember Post stated he would like information on how other municipalities are billing for Stormwater services.

Mayor Pro Tem Heggins questioned which option will be easiest and most amenable for the residents.

Councilmember Sheffield indicated she would like information regarding how other municipalities are billing for Stormwater services, a cost analysis including the average cost for businesses and residents, the impact and difference between renters and owners, and citizen feedback.

Councilmember Sheffield asked if there is a timeline to choose an option. Mr. Bailey stated the decision for the tax bill option would have to be made by April 2021. He indicated the options can be discussed further at the second meeting in January 2021 or following the retreat.

(b) **2021 Council Retreat**

City Manager Lane Bailey noted the City Council Retreat will be held virtually because of COVID-19. He indicated the Retreat will take place on February 10, 2021 from 5:00 p.m. until 8:00 p.m. and on February 11, 2021 from 5:00 p.m. until 8:00 p.m.

**COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Councilmember Sheffield asked if the City has moratoriums that are ongoing regarding utility service assistance or other COVID-19 related assistance. Mayor Alexander replied the moratorium for utility service assistance had ended.

Councilmember Sheffield indicated things do not seem to be getting better and Rowan County has suffered many losses due to COVID-19. She stated she hopes everyone is staying safe and following the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines.

Councilmember Sheffield acknowledged Mr. Mark Martin who was the City Arborist for several years and retired at the end 2020.
Councilmember Post indicated the pickleball courts are continuing to stay crowded in spite of the cold weather, and he is pleased to have the courts for the citizens of Salisbury.

**MAYOR PRO TEM COMMENTS**

Mayor Pro Tem Heggins thanked staff for a great New Year Celebration and for hard work completed throughout the year in 2020. She wished everyone a happy and prosperous 2021. She reminded everyone to stay safe, wash hands, and continue to social distance and wear a mask. She encouraged those who are allowed to take the COVID-19 vaccine.

**MAYOR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMENTS**

Mayor Alexander announced the following events:

(a) **Community Resource Fair**

The Winter Drive-Thru Community Resource Fair will be held Saturday, January 16, 2021 from 11:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. at the Civic Center located at 315 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue. The Resource Fair is being held in conjunction with the annual MLK Celebration Weekend to provide information and support for families. One bag per family, while supplies last. Walk-ups are also welcome. For more information, please contact Anne Little at anne.little@salisburync.gov or call (704) 638-5218.

(b) **Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Celebration**

The Human Relations Council will host its annual Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Celebration Weekend with the theme “United in Service to Remember the Dream.” A Community Day of Service will be held Monday, January 18, 2021 with the adoption of Kelsey Scott Park and a COVID-19 compliant clean-up and sign placement (weather permitting). A delivery of donated items will be made to Rowan Helping Ministries at 11:00 a.m., and at 2:00 p.m. a Virtual Program will air on WSRG-TV and Facebook at 2:00 p.m. For more information, please contact Anne Little at anne.little@salisburync.gov or call (704) 638-5218.

(c) **Feedback-Downtown Main Street Plan**

The public is invited to provide feedback on the proposed Downtown Main Street Plan presented to Council at its December 1, 2020 meeting. The plan will be presented virtually to the Community Appearance Commission January 5, 2021 at 4:00 p.m., to the Neighborhood Leaders Alliance January 21, 2021 at 4:00 p.m. and at a Main Street meeting January 27, 2021 at 6:00 p.m. Several meetings will be held outdoors and in person including the Historic Preservation Commission on January 14, 2021 at 1:00 p.m. at City Hall, January 22, 2021 at 8:00 a.m. in front of Koco Java located at 329 S. Main Street, and January 22, 2021 at 11:30 a.m. in front of the
Wells Fargo Building located at 231 S. Main St. For Zoom meeting links and to view the draft plan please visit www.salisburync.gov/mainstplan.

Mayor Alexander indicated Phase 1-A for the COVID-19 vaccine is in progress and will continue throughout the week. She explained Rowan County public health will begin Phase 1-B on January 11, 2021. She added additional information regarding the vaccine will be posted to the City website. She stated those who receive the vaccine will need to continue to be safe and follow CDC guidelines. She encouraged everyone to take the vaccine when it becomes available.

Mayor Alexander thanked staff for continuing to providing excellent service to citizens and she wished everyone a Happy New Year.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Councilmember Miller. All Council members in attendance agreed unanimously to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

___________________________________
Karen Alexander, Mayor

______________________________________
Kelly Baker, City Clerk
 Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Please Select Submission Category:  ☑ Public  ☑ Council  ☑ Manager  ☑ Staff

Requested Council Meeting Date:  January 19, 2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request:  City Engineering

Name of Presenter(s):  Wendy Brindle, City Engineer

Requested Agenda Item:  Request from Spectrum for encroachment into City Rights-of-Way

Description of Requested Agenda Item:  Spectrum requests approval of installation of directional bored duct within the City Right-of-Way on Lash Drive. City Council approval of encroachments is required by Section 11-24 (27) of the City Code.

Staff review included input from Engineering, Public Services and Salisbury-Rowan Utilities. Staff recommends approval subject to the following conditions:

- All improvements and restoration shall be made at no expense to the City.
- Any markers for underground facilities shall be flush with the ground.
- Lane closures shall be coordinated through Engineering.
- Spectrum shall participate with the State’s one-call locating program, and appropriate locator tape shall be installed to facilitate future field location.
- Bore placement must stay 11’ behind curb line with the bore behind the fire hydrant.
- Engineering “as-built” plans shall be maintained by Spectrum and made available to the City upon request.
- If the City (or State) makes an improvement to the public Right-of-Way, Spectrum facilities shall be adjusted or relocated at no expense to the City (or State).

Attachments:  ☑ Yes  ☐ No

Fiscal Note:  (If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)

There is no budgetary impact on this item.

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item:  (Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)
City Council to consider approval of a right-of-way encroachment by Spectrum on Lash Drive per Section 11-24 (27) of the City Code.

Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Wendy Brindle – 704-638-5201

☒ Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)
December 14, 2020

Please find enclosed a CATV base map along with the attached typically to be in order.

The location is approx. 1521’ or .288 miles S of Statesville Blvd (US Hwy 70) working along 430 Lash Dr in City of Salisbury. The enclosed CATV base map can be used as a reference in locating the area in which Spectrum will be working. This will be to place 322’ or .061 miles of underground 2” conduit encasing .625’ coax CATV facilities on City of Salisbury ROW. There will be (1) directional bore on this project.

Will comply with the MUTCD.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (704) 378-2851.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Tim Burris

Tim Burris
Spectrum Southeast, LLC
Construction Manager

Approval: ______________________
Division Engineer: ______________________
District Engineer: ______________________
 Salisbury City Council  
Agenda Item Request Form

Please Select Submission Category:  ☒ Public  ☐ Council  ☐ Manager  ☒ Staff

Requested Council Meeting Date:  January 19, 2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request:  Finance/Shannon Moore

Name of Presenter(s):  Shannon Moore, Finance Director

Requested Agenda Item:  Appropriate Donations from Share2Care Funds

Description of Requested Agenda Item:  Council to appropriate the donations to from December 2020 through the Share 2 Care Funds. Once appropriated, the funds will be distributed to Rowan Helping Ministries to administer through their utility assistance program. From December 1 – December 31, 2020 donations totaled $1,155.

Attachments:  ☒ Yes  ☐ No

Fiscal Note:  *(If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)*

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item:  *(Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)*
Council to approve budget ordinance appropriating donations from the Share2Care Fund.

Contact Information for Group or Individual:
Shannon Moore 704-216-8026

☒ Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)

☐ Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

Finance Manager Signature

Department Head Signature

Budget Manager Signature

****All agenda items must be submitted at least 7 days before the requested Council meeting date****

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only
☐ Approved  ☐ Delayed  ☐ Declined

Reason:
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2020-2021 BUDGET ORDINANCE
OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA TO APPROPRIATE
DONATIONS IN THE SHARE 2 CARE FUND

Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Salisbury, North Carolina, as follows:

Section 1. The City has established a Share2Care Fund to receive Water & Sewer assistance donations to be administered and distributed by Rowan Helping Ministries. NC General Statutes require that the City appropriate these revenues so that they can be legally spent.

Section 2. That the 2020-2021 Budget Ordinance of the City of Salisbury, adopted on June 16, 2020, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) That the following Share2Care Fund line items be amended as follows:

1) Increase line item 033-000-000-482133  
Share To Care Donations  
$1,155

2) Increase line item 033-000-000-539901  
Miscellaneous Expense  
$1,155

Section 4. That all ordinances, or parts of ordinances, in conflict with this ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

Section 5. That this ordinance shall be effective from and after its passage.
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Please Select Submission Category: ☐ Public ☐ Council ☐ Manager ☒ Staff

Requested Council Meeting Date: January 19, 2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request: City of Salisbury, Engineering Department

Name of Presenter(s): Wendy Brindle, City Engineer

Requested Agenda Item: Permanently close a portion of an alley in the 800 block of W. Cemetery Street

Description of Requested Agenda Item:
On November 17, 2020, City Council adopted a resolution of intent to permanently close a portion of an alley, referenced as Elite Street, in the 800 block of West Cemetery Street. A public hearing was held virtually on January 5, 2021, and the public hearing remained open for 24 hours with no additional comments.

Street and alley closings are regulated by General Statute 160A-299. In accordance with the statute, closing of a street must not be "contrary to the public interest", and no individual shall be "deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress to his property" by the closing. Staff believes that these conditions have been satisfied, and recommends that Council proceed with the closing.

Attachments: ☒ Yes ☐ No

Fiscal Note: (If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item: (Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)
1) Adopt a resolution accepting an offer of dedication for the right-of-way
2) Adopt an Order to close a portion of an alley in the 800 block of West Cemetery Street, subject to utility easements

Contact Information for Group or Individual:
Wendy Brindle, City Engineer
704-638-5201/wbrin@salisburync.gov

☒ Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)

☐ Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

________________________________________  ________________________________________
Finance Manager Signature                  Department Head Signature
Budget Manager Signature

****All agenda items must be submitted at least 7 days before the requested Council meeting date****

For Use in Clerk's Office Only

☐ Approved

☐ Declined

Reason:
RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO THE ACCEPTANCE OF AN OFFER OF DEDICATION FOR PUBLIC USE OF AN ALLEY IN THE 800 BLOCK OF WEST CEMETERY STREET

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Salisbury is considering a proposal for the closing of the portion of an alley in the 800 block of West Cemetery Street, which is more particularly described as follows:

_Beginning at an existing #5 rebar on the western right-of-way of West Cemetery Street, the southeast corner of Rowan Health Service Corp. (Deed Book 1015 page 465), said corner also being S 00° 26’ 06” W, 234.81’ from an existing #4 rebar at the southwest intersection of Woodson Street and West Cemetery Street, thence with the western right-of-way of West Cemetery Street, S 00° 26’ 06” W, 26.30’ to a new #5 rebar, the northeast corner of Roweye, LLC (Deed Book 973 Page 941) thence with Roweye’s north line, N 87° 39’ 14” W, 118.81’ to an existing #5 rebar, Roweye’s northwest corner, thence a new line crossing Elite Street, N 01° 49’ 32” E, 26.26’ to a new #5 rebar in the south line of Rowan Health Services Corp, thence with their line S 87° 40’ 04” E, 118.17’ to the point and place of Beginning and Being 0.071 acres as shown on survey and map by Shulenburger Surveying Company, P.A. date 02/06/2020._

and

WHEREAS, the City Council of Salisbury has the authority to accept the dedication of the aforementioned right of way;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the City Council accepts the offer of dedication for public use the aforementioned right of way on this 19th day of January 2021.
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF ROWAN

IN THE MATTER OF:
CLOSING A PORTION OF AN ALLEY IN
THE 800 BLOCK OF W CEMETERY ST

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF
THE CITY OF SALISBURY
NORTH CAROLINA

ORDER CLOSING A PORTION OF AN
ALLEY IN THE 800 BLOCK OF W
CEMETERY STREET

THIS CAUSE, coming on to be heard and being heard before the City Council of the City of Salisbury, Rowan County, North Carolina, at the regular meeting of said Council held on January 19, 2021 at 6:00 p.m., and it appearing to the Council that persons, firms, and corporations owning property adjoining the alley described in the Petition filed in this cause were properly notified of the Petition; and it further appearing that said alley is not maintained by the Department of Transportation; and it further appearing that notice of this hearing was duly published in THE SALISBURY POST on November 22 and 29, and December 6 and 13, 2020.

And it further appearing to the Council and the Council finding as a fact, that the closing of the alley, as described in the Petition filed in this cause, is not contrary to the public interest or the property rights of any individual, and that no individual owning property in the vicinity of said right of way or in the subdivision in which they are located will be deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress to his property by the closing of said alley; and it further appearing to this Council that the relief prayed in the Petition should be granted.
IT IS NOW, THEREFORE, ORDERED AND DECREED by the City Council of the City of Salisbury, Rowan County, North Carolina, pursuant to and in accordance with the authority vested in this Council by the General Statutes of North Carolina, Section 160A-299, that a portion of the alley located in the 800 block of West Cemetery Street, which is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at an existing #5 rebar on the western right-of-way of West Cemetery Street, the southeast corner of Rowan Health Service Corp. (Deed Book 1015 page 465), said corner also being S 00° 26' 06" W, 234.81' from an existing #4 rebar at the southwest intersection of Woodson Street and West Cemetery Street, thence with the western right-of-way of West Cemetery Street, S 00° 26' 06" W, 26.30' to a new #5 rebar, the northeast corner of Roweye, LLC (Deed Book 973 Page 941) thence with Roweye’s north line, N 87° 39' 14" W, 118.81' to an existing #5 rebar, Roweye’s northwest corner, thence a new line crossing Elite Street, N 01° 49' 32" E, 26.26' to a new #5 rebar in the south line of Rowan Health Services Corp, thence with their line S 87° 40' 04" E, 118.17' to the point and place of Beginning and Being 0.071 acres as shown on survey and map by Shulenburger Surveying Company, P.A. date 02/06/2020.

Be and the same is hereby forever CLOSED, with the reservation of 30’ easements, centered on existing water and sewer lines.

This the 19th day of January 2021.

CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY,
NORTH CAROLINA

BY: ____________________________
Karen K. Alexander, Mayor

________________________________
Kelly Baker, City Clerk
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Please Select Submission Category:  ☑ Public  ☐ Council  ☐ Manager  ☐ Staff

Requested Council Meeting Date: 01/19/2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request: Community Planning Services

Name of Presenter(s): Catherine Garner

Requested Agenda Item: Council to hold a public hearing and consider adoption of an ordinance designating the “Moore House,” located at 124 S Ellis Street in Salisbury, North Carolina, as a Local Historic Landmark.

Description of Requested Agenda Item: NCGS 160D-945 authorizes the governing body of municipalities to designate historic landmarks that are deemed and found by the Historic Preservation Commission to be of special significance in terms of its historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance and to possess integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and/or association.

On February 13, 2020 the Historic Preservation Commission received a Local Historic Landmark (LHL) pre-application from Robert Lambrecht and Jon Planovsky, owners/applicants, and Pete Prunkl, agent. The Commission found that the property may meet the requirements of LHL designation. The applicant prepared the attached LHL report, which was submitted to the NC State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for review and comment, per NCGS 160D-946. The SHPO submitted a response on November 12, 2020, which included suggested changes to the document for clarity and accuracy. On December 10, 2020, the Historic Preservation Commission received a final Local Historic Landmark application from the property owner and agent. The Commission found that the property has special significance for its architectural and cultural importance and that it retains most aspects of its integrity. The Commission voted 6-0 (2 absent, 1 recused) to recommend approval of the LHL application to City Council.

The Moore House is a contributing structure to the Salisbury Historic District (West Square Local Historic District). If approved, this would be the sixth LHL and the third LHL within a National Register district.

Attachments: ☑ Yes  ☐ No

Fiscal Note: (If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item: (Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)
Council to hold a public hearing and consider adoption of an ordinance designating the “Moore House,” located at 124 S Ellis Street in Salisbury, North Carolina, as a Local Historic Landmark.

Contact Information for Group or Individual: Catherine Garner, catherine.garner@salisburync.gov; 704-638-5212
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

☐ Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)

☒ Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________   _____________________________
Finance Manager Signature     Department Head Signature

______________________________
Budget Manager Signature

***All agenda items must be submitted at least 7 days before the requested Council meeting date***

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved  ☐ Delayed  ☐ Declined

Reason:
## Case #:
HL-02-2019

## Case Staff:
Catherine Garner

## Owner(s):
Robert Lambrecht and Jon Planovsky

## Applicant(s):
Same

## Authorized Agent(s):
Pete Prunkl

### LOCATION

**District:** Salisbury Historic District (National Register) / West Square (Local Historic District)

**Building:** Moore House

**Street:** 124 S Ellis Street

**Tax Parcel #:** 010 014

### BUILDING DESCRIPTION:

**Classification:** Contributing

**Year Built:** Ca. 1893

**Style:** Shingle

**Project Type:** Local Historic Landmark Application

### APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF CATEGORIES A. THROUGH D. FOR LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS:

Based upon the application submitted, the applicant is proposing that the Moore House is significant under Criterion B and Criterion C.

B. Properties that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

C. Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

Criterion A and D are appropriate for places that have significance regarding an event (such as a battlefield) or have the potential to yield information through archaeological remains only, respectively.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION/ELEMENTS:

*Please refer to the information provided with the application.*
LOCAL LANDMARK CRITERIA:

Per G. S. 160D-945, no property shall be recommended for designation as a historic landmark unless it is deemed and found by the preservation commission to be of special significance in terms of its historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance and to possess integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling and/or association.

STAFF FINDINGS:

Special Significance
- This property’s special significance is for its cultural importance as the home of Miss Beulah Stewart Moore. Miss Beulah was the editor of the Salisbury Truth newspaper and the Carolina Watchman, as well as an artist and civic activist in Salisbury.

Integrity
- Design – The exterior of the Moree House retains excellent integrity of its Shingle design. The house is clad in two different types of wood siding: shingles on the upper story and clapboard on the lower story. The landmark report catalogs several changes made to the house after construction, many by Miss Beulah herself. Modern changes were made in the 1950s under previous ownership; the current owners have restored many interior and exterior architectural details including chimneys and wood moldings. The applicant is requesting portions of the interior to be landmarked as well to protect these restored elements.

The design of the structure is heavily influenced by the work of Frederick G. S. Bryce, an architect who published drawings in several popular art and architecture industry publications of the age. As explained in the landmark report, it is believed that Miss Beulah copied Bryce’s “Five Thousand Dollar House” based on an advertisement seen in April 1892.

- Setting – The house sits on a relatively level parcel in the first block of South Ellis Street. Miss Beulah purchased the land that the current rock driveway sits on at the north side of the house and existing landscaping shields the property from the commercial property surrounding it. The house retains its setting in a residential neighborhood; the adjacent surrounding houses were constructed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century time-frame.

- Workmanship – The house possesses a high degree of integrity in the workmanship category. The granite detailing of the chimneys, the front Romanesque arch and engaged turret. The windows are original to the structure, as designed and modified by Miss Beulah after construction.

- Materials – The locally hewn granite on both the primary structure retains its integrity. The wood features, of which this house has many, are either original or replaced to match. A significant, though not detracting, change to the house was Miss Beulah’s replacement of the original wood shingle roof with asphalt shingles in the first quarter of the twentieth century. This change was made because of a change in heat source to reduce risk of fire and prolong the maintenance cycle of the roof.

- Feeling – The Moore House retains its feeling as an in-town estate house in a residential area. It still sits on its original lot, which does not appear to have been reduced in size, and is buffered from modern commercial intrusions on two sides by mature landscaping.
The houses surrounding it, though of different styles, are of relatively comparable age and size to the Moore House.

- **Association** – Through careful restoration, the house still retains the Shingle look that Miss Beulah desired for her home. There have been no irreversible changes that impact the overall look of the house. It sufficiently retains its association with Miss Beulah Stewart Moore.

Staff finds that the Moore House retains its special significance under Criterion B for Miss Beulah’s contributions to the City of Salisbury through her civic and artistic work and Criterion C for the Moore House’s status as a fine example of a Shingle style house in the city. Staff finds that the house retains integrity of design, workmanship, feeling, and association.

**PRE-APPLICATION DECISION**

Based upon the staff recommendation, the Commission approved the Local Historic Landmark pre-application for the Moore House (Parcel ID 010 01) as the property may be found to qualify as a Local Historic Landmark.

**SHPO COMMENT**

The report was submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for their review and comment period as required by NCGS 160D-946. On November 12, 2020, SHPO’s response was received and provided by staff to the applicant and their agent. SHPO concurred with the applicant that the Moore House has a clear association with Miss Beulah and that the house retained its architectural integrity as a Shingle style house. The reviewers made a suggestion to the applicant and their agent about strengthening the integrity discussion and it has been incorporated into the final report, attached.

**HPC: ACTION ON THE LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARK APPLICATION**

The HPC held a public hearing at their December 10, 2020 regular meeting. The Commission reviewed the final report, SHPO comment letter, and staff report. Mr. Pete Prunkl spoke on behalf of the application. The Commission voted unanimously of members present to find that the property exhibits special significance and integrity and to recommend approval of the designation to City Council.
LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARK APPLICATION

FILING DATE:          □ WITHIN A LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT
CASE NUMBER:          □ INDIVIDUALLY LISTED ON NATIONAL REGISTER

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Rowan County Parcel ID(s): 010-014
Address: 124 SOUTH ELLIS ST. SALISBURY NC 28144
Historic Name of Property: THE MOORE HOUSE
Date of Original Construction: 1892    Date of Alterations: See Report
National Register District: SALISBURY    Local Historic District: WEST SQUARE
Individually listed on National Register: NO    Year Listed: N/A

OWNER INFORMATION

Property Owner: BOB LAMBERT & JON PLANOVSKY
Address: 124 SOUTH ELLIS ST.
         SALISBURY NC 28144
Email: JPSKY@YAHOO.COM    Phone: 704-433-1059

APPLICATION AGENT INFORMATION

Name: PETE PRUNKL
Address: 421 SOUTH ELLIS ST. SALISBURY NC 28144
Email: PPRUNKL@GMAIL.COM    Phone: 704-633-9641

SIGNATURE

I, the requested additional information is provided and is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I have read the information packet regarding the process for local historic landmark designation. I understand that the submittal of this application does not guarantee the approval as a local historic landmark.

I understand that if approved, this property becomes bound by the Historic District Design Guidelines for all future changes.

I am aware that Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) members, or staff, may enter upon private land at reasonable times to inspect the work or the site solely in performance of their duties.

Owner(s):
Applicant:
Application Last Revised: MARCH, 2020
APPICATION NARRATIVE

This application initiates consideration of a property for local historic landmark status. Submittal of this application does not mean that a property is being designated as a local historic landmark at this time, nor does the submittal of this application guarantee designation.

This portion of the application will be reviewed by staff and the NC State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), who will render comments on the property proposed for designation. Upon return of the SHPO's comments, the Salisbury HPC will hold a public hearing to determine if this property meets the special significance and integrity criteria as outlined in the information materials and make a recommendation to City Council. City Council will also hold a public hearing on the item. City Council makes the final decision on whether a property is designated as a landmark. They can approve the request as submitted, as amended, or deny the proposed landmark.

Please carefully consider the attached checklist. This information is the minimum required to determine whether a property could be evaluated as a local historic landmark. If a National Register nomination is being utilized as part of this application, consider the age. The architectural description may need to be rewritten to document changes to the structure. This narrative must be typed. All submitted materials become the property of the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission and cannot be returned.

Initials of owner(s): [Signature]  Initials of agent: [Signature]
The Moore House
124 South Ellis Street
Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

Local Landmark Report

Prepared by
Pete Prunkl, freelance writer

To accompany
Local Historic Landmark Application

Completed October 2020
Revised November 2020 following review by
N.C. State Historic Preservation Commission
Local Landmark Report

The Moore House, Salisbury, North Carolina
Reference: Local Landmark Reports, SHPO, Raleigh

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1: Common and Historic Name of the Property:

The Moore House

2: Physical Address:

124 South Ellis Street, Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

3: Tax Parcel Identification Number:

010-014

4: Current Owners:

Robert L. Lambrecht and Jon Planovsky

5. Current Owners Mailing Address:

124 South Ellis Street, Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

6: Appraised Value of the Property:

$335,552

2. ABSTRACT

The c. 1892 Moore House meets the qualifications of a local landmark because it was the primary residence of noted Salisbury citizen Beulah Stewart Moore (1865-1949) and because it is an outstanding example of the Shingle Style based on the design of architect F. G. S. Bryce.  

Ms. Moore’s many contributions to both her hometown of Salisbury and the state of North Carolina are well known and documented. Her home figured prominently in her many gatherings and activities. The house itself retains all of its key Shingle Style characteristics with minimal exterior modifications since the historical period of its construction and Ms. Moore’s residence. This request for local landmark designation includes the exterior of Moore’s 3,580 sq. ft. (approximate) granite and wood house on a .536-acre lot and selected interior features. All the contemporary or relocated outbuildings are excluded from the protections afforded a local landmark.

3. HISTORIC BACKGROUND

Beulah Stewart Moore

Beulah Stewart, born in Salisbury on July 17, 1865, was the first child of John Joseph Stewart (1837-1896) and Clara Lois Bruner Stewart (1845-1927). Beulah’s maternal grandfather was John Joseph Bruner (1817-1890), the owner and editor of the Carolina Watchman (active 1832-1937), the first weekly newspaper published in Salisbury. In 1895, Miss Beulah, her preferred name, succeeded her father as editor of the Salisbury Truth (active 1887-1900) newspaper and the Carolina Watchman, becoming the third generation of her family to be a newspaper editor, a remarkable achievement for a woman at the close of the 19th century.  

---

1 See Supporting Documentation number 23 for an example of Shingle Style houses on South Ellis Street.
2 “Miss Beulah” Moore Succumbs at Rowan Memorial Hospital, Salisbury Post, April 16, 1949; Miss Beulah takes her place in history, Salisbury Post, April 10, 2009; Miss Beulah: Champion of All Causes by Mark Jane Park, Salisbury Evening Post, April 10-18, 1976; The Concord Times, October 31, 1895, Beulah Moore succeeds her father as editor of the Salisbury Truth
Miss Beulah married locomotive engineer James Preston Moore (1861-1931) on September 16, 1883. After they married, Beulah, a gifted twenty-year old, went north to New York to pursue her talents and study art with nationally prominent artists Elliott Daingerfield (North Carolina, 1859-1932) and William Merritt Chase (1849-1916). Miss Beulah returned to Salisbury not only as an artist and art teacher, but also as someone exposed to the new ideas, latest styles, and societal change taking place in New York. On September 4, 1894, Miss Beulah invited Daingerfield to visit her home and speak about his evolving art with local artists and friends. Shortly before his visit to Salisbury, Daingerfield completed his Symbolist masterpiece, *The Mystic Brim* and was about to embark on a series of Tonalist paintings of North Carolina mountain landscapes. He had much to discuss with the Salisbury artists. 3

Early in her career, Miss Beulah was asked to draw from memory the Spruce Macay law office, where Andrew Jackson briefly studied law. Macay’s Salisbury office was lost on its way to Philadelphia for the 1876 Centennial International Exposition. Miss Beulah’s memory drawing is the only known depiction of the historic building. 4

Miss Beulah’s contributions to Salisbury were many. In 1909, she founded and served as the first president of the Travelers’ Club. Two years later, she rallied the club to support the establishment of the Rowan Public Library. A plaque on the library grounds erected in 2009 honors her efforts. 5 She was a member of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Daughters of the Confederacy, the Daughters of the King, and the local women’s suffrage league. In 1894, she set aside a room at her home for the local chapter of the Daughters of the King. In 1910, she served the local DAR chapter as Regent; later she was appointed North Carolina state historian. According to her obituary, 6 Miss Beulah supported the new Salisbury YWCA and hosted a fundraiser at her house circa 1912. An examination of the early records of the YWCA, did not reveal any mention of Miss Beulah or the fundraiser.

In 1916, the Elizabeth Maxwell Steele chapter of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution republished the 1881 *History of Rowan County, North Carolina* by Rev. Jethro Rumple. Miss Beulah wrote the new preface to Rumple’s famous history and the biography of Carolina Watchman Publisher J. J. Bruner, her grandfather. The Society republished the book to add newer historical research, supplemental facts and photos. It is a testimony of Miss Beulah’s status in the Salisbury community that she was asked to write these introductory chapters. 7

Arguably her most daring accomplishment, Miss Beulah was the first woman to run for mayor of Salisbury in 1921. Although defeated in the Democratic primary, her platform wanting “…the people to run the town” was historic, nonetheless. 8

Miss Beulah was active in civic affairs well into her 70s. For three years (1941-1943), she again served as Regent (president) of the Elizabeth Maxwell Steele chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. In 1943, she was asked to serve as the first president of the Civic League, an organization created by the Rowan County Chamber of Commerce. 9

Miss Beulah was the subject of at least 18 articles in the *Salisbury Post* and the *Carolina Watchman*. She was an outspoken, civic minded character who often walked to town with a parrot on her shoulder. She spoke and acted with authority. 10

---

3 *A Delightful Evening*, Carolina Watchman, September 20, 1894; *Elliott Daingerfield at Moore House*
4 *Beyond the Hedges: Historic Salisbury Foundation and the Preservation Movement* by Pete Prunkl, Historic Salisbury Foundation, 2020
5 *Travelers Club Marker*, Salisbury Post, May 6, 2014; *Miss Beulah takes her place in history*, Salisbury Post, April 10, 2009
6 “*Miss Beulah* Moore Succumbs at Rowan Memorial Hospital*, Salisbury Post, April 16, 1949
7 See Supporting Documentation, number 19, at the end of this document
8 *Beulah Moore Spoke Her Mind*, Salisbury Post February 19, 1995; *First Female Mayoral Candidate was a Thoroughly Modern Woman*, Salisbury Post, February 6, 1995
9 *Miss Beulah* Moore Succumbs at Rowan Memorial Hospital*, Salisbury Post, April 16, 1949
10 See entire list of citations referencing the *Salisbury Post* and *Carolina Watchman* in the Bibliography at the end of this document
Her obituary published on April 16, 1949 stated: “Alert throughout her adult life to the public issues of the passing years, she was always exceedingly well-informed and outspoken. Though her incisive comments in polite conversation were sometimes too keen for the comfort of the stuffy and self-satisfied, they were always so ‘in character’ with her deep kindness and complete honesty that no hurt ever came from her...”

Shingle Style and F. G. S. Bryce

The Shingle Style came into being as a turn away from the excesses and ornamentation of the Victorian period. Coinciding with the nation’s centennial, architects looked back to vernacular American colonial architecture and found inspiration in the geometric forms, sloping rooflines, and natural materials of weathered wood and stone.

In 1890, architect Frederick G. S. Bryce (c.1858-1893) began publishing architectural drawings in the Art Amateur and the Art Interchange magazines.

In April 1892, Art Interchange published his design for a “Five Thousand Dollar House.” Accompanying the house’s floor plans were interior and exterior views as well as a written description detailing various colors, finishes, and materials. As an artist herself, Miss Beulah likely received the Art Interchange and the design must have captured her imagination. Her architectural plans for the house and the Bryce house are nearly identical. Tragically, Bryce died suddenly on May 24, 1893 at age 35.

Miss Beulah was not the only person inspired by Bryce’s 1892 design. Noted architect Ernest G. W. Dietrich (1857-1924), borrowed many elements of Bryce’s design for his John K. Williams residence in Hartford, Connecticut, built in 1898. Described and illustrated in House and Garden and Architects’ and Builders Magazine, the Williams residence was deeded to Hartford Seminary in 1951 and demolished c. 1961. The Williams House is a near replica of the earlier Moore House.

Ownership

From information obtained at the Rowan County Register of Deeds, Miss Beulah purchased the real estate at 124 South Ellis Street from Alice Pearson on June 18, 1891 (book 75, page 568). The current c. 1892 structure replaced one that was positioned further east closer to the street. Miss Beulah remained in the house she built until 1947, when ill health forced her to relocate to convalescent care. She sold the house to Virginia and Paul Caldwell and the widow Lucy Deese on February 12, 1947, a sale recorded in book 303, page 290 at the Rowan County Register of Deeds Office. The Caldwells lived there for four years and sold the house to W. Talmage Shuford on June 23, 1951 (book 350, page 293). Mr. Shuford kept the house until December 1, 1980, when Paul Hinkle purchased it (book 595, page 161). At Hinkle’s death, ownership was transferred to his wife, Martha (book 853, page 33). When Martha married Timothy Smith, a new deed was recorded in book 864, page 92. Current owners Robert Lambrecht and Jon Planovsky purchased the house on February 1, 2007 (book 1086, page 65).

Modifications

Photographs taken of the Moore House during and after construction verify the modifications Miss Beulah made to the house. During the first decade of the 20th century, Miss Beulah added a 12’ X 15’ room to the back of the kitchen and an exit door from the new room to the back patio. At about the same time, she replaced the ground-level lattice coverings on the north, west and south elevations with granite.

---

11 Information regarding F. G.S. Bryce and the drawings in Art Amateur and Art Interchange magazines were obtained through interviews and correspondence with architect Christopher Jend, senior associate at Pei Cobb Freed & Partners, New York, City, March-August 2020
12 See Supporting Documentation numbers 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 at the end of this document.
13 See Supporting Documentation number 22 at the end of this document
14 See Supporting Documentation numbers 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
blocks and brick piers. Within this foundation crawl space, she added three vents on the front elevation, three on the south elevation, three vents and two wood casement windows on the rear elevation and two vents on the north side.

Photos indicate that soon after the house was constructed, Miss Beulah changed several features in her second-floor painting studio/classroom in the corner of the south and rear elevations. She leveled the side porch roof, framed the now walk-on porch with a low railing and replaced the second-floor wood studio window with French doors. Each wood French door has 12-lights, a raised wood panel and its own period screen door. On the east or rear elevation, she replaced the original wood 4/4 double fixed windows in her studio with two diamond-pattern wood casement windows with a shallow hood. 15

She converted other windows to the framed diamond-pattern: the original 36 light stationary window in the dining room and on the second-floor balcony, the window in the original glass and raised panel door and the wood casement windows that flanked the balcony door.

Circa 1913, Miss Beulah no longer used the fireplaces to heat the house. She had steam heat and radiators installed throughout the house. The present owners reopened the fireplaces and found the chimneys stuffed with newspapers from 1913. To prevent fire, reduce maintenance expense and increase the roof’s life expectancy, Miss Beulah replaced the wooden shake shingles with asphalt architectural shingles around the time of the steam heat installation.

During the 1950s, the Shufords made several interior changes. They modernized the heating system and removed the radiators. They also removed several wooden decorative features – the spandrels in the turret alcove, the columns on the two pony walls, the ball and stick sides from the entrance fireplace, the balls from the ball and stick spindles on the staircase, all the picture rail molding and the ball top on the newel post. They also enlarged the footprint of the small kitchen by removing two pantry walls which divided the kitchen. All of the pre-change original features are documented with historic photographs.

After removing five of the eight fireplace surrounds, the Shufords walled over the five openings. They left three original fireplace surrounds – one in the entrance hall, the parlor and the second-floor nursery. Only the parlor fireplace has its original tile facing.

The Shufords converted an upstairs closet into a bathroom and a downstairs storage space into a half-bathroom. They also built small corner closets in two upstairs bedrooms and the nursery.

Soon after purchasing the house in 2007, the current owners began restoring the house to the period of its construction. The south elevation chimney was reconstructed in 2007 with its original granite crown, new brick center and original granite base. At the same time, the central chimney was rebuilt to the roof line with its original granite crown and new brick base. In 2010, they reproduced and reinstalled a copper finial on the turret cap.

Moving to the interior, the current owners uncovered the five Shuford-enclosed fireboxes and installed period surrounds and period tile. The four downstairs fireplaces are now gas-burning and operable. The current owners removed the carpeting, refinished the quarter-sawn oak and heart pine floors and replaced all the picture rail molding with a copies milled from a scrap found in the attic.

The Shufords also restored several doors on the first floor. They installed 2/6 reproduction mullions with glass in the original French door frames to the porch, a configuration that matched the original design. For the back door on the west elevation, they restored its original 2/2 configuration and transom.

15 See Supporting Documentation numbers 6 and 7 at the end of this document.
Extending 15’ from the house is a brick patio constructed from bricks reclaimed from Grimes Mill, the 1897 Salisbury flour mill destroyed by fire in 2013. A 19’ x 8’ pavered patio extending from side porch steps towards the rear of yard and a reclaimed brick patio length of house abuts paver patio at side porch.

4. ASSESSMENT

The Moore House meets both criteria for landmark status. The person who first resided here was an important woman in Salisbury’s history and the house she built is an outstanding example of America’s Shingle style (1880-1900). The Moore House was selected as a national example of the Shingle Style (gambrel roof) in A Field Guide to American Homes. The authors called attention to the unusual cantilevered balcony over the entrance. As Shingle style houses were predominantly built in the coastal Northeast, the selection of a house from Salisbury attests to its truly representative characteristics of this style. Of the few Shingle style houses in Salisbury, the Moore House is one of the largest, truest and most untouched examples. Over the years, several local and national organizations have focused attention on the Moore House. Historic Salisbury Foundation choose it for OctoberTour, its annual tour of historic houses, in 1981, 1988, 1996 and 2004. A photo of the Moore House was on the cover of the 2004 house tour brochure. The Laura Ashley Company selected the Moore House as one of two Salisbury houses for their 1990 Home Catalogue. Laura Ashley designers repapered the first-floor turret alcove and entrance parlor for the photo shoot and both rooms appeared in the 1990 catalogue. In 2006, the Moore House was featured in an episode of If These Walls Could Talk on the HGTV network.

5. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

The 100 and 200 blocks of South Ellis Street are located one-half mile from Salisbury’s town center, the intersection of Innes and Main Streets. The Moore House is the first residence on the west side of South Ellis Street and abuts the parking lot of Sun Trust Bank at 507 West Innes Street. Neighboring houses to the south are Queen Anne dating from the last decade of the 19th century. An exception is the Greek Revival c. 1850 Ellis-Pearson House at 200 South Ellis Street. Beulah Stewart Moore grew up south of the Moore House at 220 South Ellis Street, a c. 1860 two-story frame house. Houses on the east side of South Ellis Street are newer dating from the first quarter of the 20th century. Further south on the east side of the street, houses are a mixture of Colonial Revival, Queen Anne and cottage style. Houses on both sides of the 100 and 200 blocks of South Ellis Street are well maintained and part of the 1975 Salisbury National Register Historic District and the 1990 local West Square Historic District.

Site

Salisbury’s city blocks are rotated approximately thirty degrees from true cardinal direction alignment, paralleling the street grid. For the purposes of this document the following description is written as if the Moore House has a true north-south orientation.

The Moore House faces east and is set back approximately 105 feet from the curb. A 17’ wide river rock driveway to the north of the house runs the entire length of the property. Miss Beulah purchased the strip of land for the driveway in 1898. To the north of the driveway and extending from the sidewalk is a row of 10’ hedges followed by a line of 20’ Eastern Red Cedar trees. The hedges, trees and a 6’ wooden fence completely isolate the house from Sun Trust Bank. At the back of the Moore House property, the Eastern Red Cedars make a right angle, turning south along the property line. Behind the trees at the rear of the property is an extension of the Sun Trust parking lot.

17 See Supporting Documentation number 23 for Shingle Style house on South Ellis Street and Supporting Document 9
18 See Supporting Documentation number 20 for OctoberTour brochure
19 Laura Ashley Home Catalogue, 1990
East Elevation (Front)

The Moore House is a rectangular 2 ½ story three-bay wood Shingle Style house completed c. 1892. A two-story gambrel roof incorporates the attic and second floor with gable ends facing east (front), south (side) and west (rear). All windows are wood and original except for the muntin pattern changes that are listed in Modifications.

The second floor is clad entirely in painted wooden shingles. On the left is a triangular frame surrounding a louvered attic vent. Below the vent are three double hung single pane windows configured 4/4, 12/1 and 4/4. At the center is a balcony with a low railing, classical columns and a Venetian iron hall lantern. At the rear of the balcony is an original wood screen door in front of a raised paneled door with diamond mullions. Diamond-pattern casement windows flank the balcony door. The windows in the turret are curved 4/1 single pane double hung windows. On the right is a pair of 4/1 single pane double hung windows with an arched shingled hood.

The first floor is a mixture of narrow clapboard on the left and right with a central uncoursed gray fieldstone turret base. On the left is a columned side porch with a low gallery and low gated entrance. All the windows on the first floor have solid window transom lights above. Next is a bow bay window formed by three single pane double hung windows with transom lights in a 4/4, 12/1 and 4/4 configuration. In the turret are two curved 4/1 single pane double hung windows with transom lights above. At the front entrance is a Romanesque arch, recessed stone porch with a 2/3 casement widow, Venetian iron hall lantern and a solid wood herringbone-style front door with hand-forged iron brackets. At the top of the arch, graduated stone corbels support a second-floor balcony. In the engaged turret are two curved 4/1 single pane double hung windows with transom lights. Further to the right are two 4/1 single pane double hung windows with transom lights.

There are three chimneys – one at center of the house, another at the south end, and a third for the kitchen. The central and kitchen chimneys were constructed with four courses of original granite at the crown followed by new red brick to the roofline. The south side chimney has an original granite crown, new red brick to the roofline and original granite from the roof to the base of the porch.

South Elevation (Side)

All windows are wood and original except for the muntin pattern changes that are listed in Modifications.

The second floor is painted wood shingles. On the left are 12-light French doors with raised panels and original French screen doors. A low gallery surrounds the second-floor porch on the west, south and east. At the center is the granite portion of the chimney. On the right is a 12/2 single pane double hung window with an arched and shingled hood.

On the first floor, the porch is reached by two sets of French doors with original French screen doors that flank the granite base of the chimney. Granite steps provide entrance to the porch at the front and rear. The porch is supported by four classical columns on wooden bases. A low gallery extends across the south elevation between the column supports. A brick foundation supports the porch.
**West Elevation (Rear)**

All windows are wood and original except the muntin pattern changes that are listed in Modifications.

Dominating this view are two two-story gambrel roofs with a two and a half story recessed wood shingled wall between them.

On the left, painted wood shingles descend from the peak to half-round molding between the second and first floors. In the peak is a triangular wood window. Below that are a 4/4 single pane double hung window, a 2/2 casement window and a 4/4 single pane double hung window with wood shingled hood.

On the second-floor center are three elongated 1/1 single pane double hung windows with an asphalt shingled hood. Behind the exterior glass are arched interior wood windows on the landing between the first and second floors. Further to the right is a 2/2 casement window. Near this window are two utility vents – one just below the eave and another on the roof.

On the right, painted wood shingles descend from the peak to half-round molding between the second and first floors. At the peak is a triangular frame for ventilation. Below that are two framed diamond-pattern casement windows. Then there is the second-floor side porch with flat roof and low gallery.

On the left of the first floor is the room Miss Beulah added to the kitchen that was described in Modifications. The room and a small portion of the first-floor gable end are painted clapboard. From left to right, the room has a solid clapboard wall, a 2/2 casement window, an 18-light wood paneled window, a hooded 4/4 single pane double hung window and hooded wood back door with its original screen door and Venetian iron hall lighting fixture. To the right of the door is a 2/2 framed casement window which opened to the pantry for ice and groceries.

On the recessed central wall is a 4/4 single pane double hung window. Just below this window in the foundation are a pair of three-light casement windows that provide air and light into a 10' x 12' unfinished concrete walled basement and crawl space. Also, on the recessed wall are a roofed back door with leaded glass transom, an original screen door, a porch with granite steps and a Venetian iron hall pendant light.

To the right on the first floor is a pair of 12/12 single pane double hung windows. Further to the right is the first-floor side porch.

**North Elevation (Side)**

All windows are wood and original except the muntin pattern changes that are listed in Modifications.

The most dramatic feature of this view is wood-shingled gable with a two-story gambrel roof that descends to the half-round molding between the second and first floors. Within the gable end are a triangular vent and a 6/1 single pane double hung window. Further to the right on the second floor is a pair of 4/4 single pane double hung windows with an arched shingled hood.

The first floor is painted clapboard. On the left is a diamond-pattern window with extended molding top and bottom. Moving to the right are three windows: a 4/4 single pane double hung window, a 10/10 single pane double hung window and a 12-pane casement window. The roof overhangs the room on the extreme right.
6. ORIGINAL INTERIOR FEATURES

Except for the few changes listed in Modifications, the house interior it is as it was in 1892. The ceiling in the grand entranceway is 11 ½.’ Flooring is 2½” quarter sawn oak. Woodwork throughout is oak with 9” crown molding, 2 ½” chair rail and 8” floor molding. Two 66” pocket doors are here with openings to the front parlor and the rear sitting room. The entrance fireplace has an oak surround with 1 ½” X 6” mottled green American Encaustic tiles in the space between the surrounding and fire box. There is a built-in carved oak window seat and decorative timber fretwork in the turret. At the rear is an oak door with leaded glass transom.

The dramatic switchback staircase has five 9’4” stair treads and two landings. The oak handrail is supported by 20” round oak handrail baluster. Newel posts are boxed with hand-carved sunbursts on three sides with ball finials atop. At the landing are three double hung oak frame windows.

Miss Beulah chose ash woodwork and 5 ¼” heart pine flooring for the front parlor. The bow bay window is described in the east elevation section. Two French doors exit to the side porch. The fireplace here has an oak surround and pale yellow 1 ½” X 6” American Encaustic tiles between firebox and surround. The walls have oak picture rail and crown molding. Twin pocket doors with 7” span provide entrance to the rear sitting room.

Woodwork in the rear sitting room is cherry with 5 ¼” heart pine flooring. Picture rail and crown molding is identical to the front parlor. The fireplace has an oak surround and mottled brown 1 ½” X 6” American Encaustic tile between fire box and surround. Like the front parlor, double French doors provide an entrance to the side porch.

For the dining room, Miss Beulah chose oak and sycamore and continued the 5 ½” heart pine flooring woodwork from the entranceway to this room. Picture rail, crown molding and waist-high wainscoting and chair rail are on all four walls. The dining room and entranceway fireplaces are of the same material and construction.

Throughout the first floor, the Eastlake hardware including door handles, door and window locks, latches and hinges is original.

A switchback servant staircase with one landing, wood handrails, wood newel posts and square balustrades to the second floor is next to kitchen.

Original recessed window seats are in the second-floor nursery, second floor bathroom and the south bedroom. The Eastlake fireplace surround in the nursery is original.

7. NEW AND NON-CONFORMING FEATURES

Four out-buildings are excluded from the landmark status application. First is a 10’ x 10’ wooden shed with one window and swing hinged door is located approximately 30’ from rear property line and on property line to the north. Second is a 10’ x 30’ wooden shed with four windows and double swing doors is situated off the southwest corner of 10’ x 10’ shed approximately 20’ from rear property line. The roofs on both sheds are asphalt shingles which are the same material and color as the house. Third is a 10’ x 12’ temporary aluminum greenhouse situated 2’ from rear property line and 30’ from north property line. The final exclusion is a 4’ x 6’ wood garden folly made from reclaimed materials with one wood window on each of three sides, a wood door on the front and a reclaimed tin shingled roof. It is located 40’ feet from rear property line and 30’ from the north property line.

See Supporting Documentation numbers 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 for photographs of these interior features.
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Venetian Iron Hall Lantern advertised in the *Art Interchange*, 1893
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The Travelers Club

In 1909, twelve ladies led by Mrs. James Preston Moore (nee Beulah Stewart) organized the Travelers Club for the purpose of becoming well informed on foreign countries and other subjects. Miss Beulah, as she was affectionately known was intelligent, outspoken and championed a cause when there was one. Interested in the betterment of their community, she and fellow Travelers spearheaded an effort to establish a public library. Engaging the help of other clubs and leading citizens, a committee was formed and Archibald Henderson Boyden was elected chairman. He offered the use of the Henderson Law Office on his property to house the library. In 1911, the forerunner of the Rowan Public Library opened on this site. Today the Travelers Club still supports the library as one of its projects.
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Beulah Stewart Moore
1865-1948
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A NEW PREFACE

has a fairer and broader historic background, as yet almost unexplored. "I'll fars it with a State whose history is written by others than her own sons!"

Is it vain to hope that some one, among "the lineal descendants and present-day representatives of an illustrious dead"—kindled afresh by the holy fires of patriotism and pride of race—will arise phoenix-like from the ashes of our indifference, and write the noble annals of our State? "Earlier colonized in point of history, full of glorious examples of patriotism and chivalric daring, North Carolina has been neglected by her own sons and others." Too long have we felt the opprobrium of this neglect.

To those who have countenanced this effort, and to the friends who have rendered valuable assistance both by suggestion and contribution, many thanks are due. Should but one reader cease to be a "mute inglorious Milton," and sing inspiredly of the valor and glory of our forebears, then your support and this little book shall not have been in vain.

—Beulah Stewart Moore

stained banner. He was ever found fighting for what he believed to be the best interests of his people, and advocating such men and measures as seemed to him just and right. An old-line Whig before the war, he aspired not to political preferment or position, but only to an honored stand in the ranks of a loyal and beneficent citizenship. Joining in with the rank and file of the white men of the conquered South, he was content to lend all his talent and energy in aiding them in the upbuilding of an impoverished section. Blameless and exemplatory in all the relations of life, a Christian gentleman, he met all the requirements of the highest citizenship—and what higher eulogy can any hope to merit?

"The great work laid upon his three-score years is done, and well done. If we drop our tears, we mourn no blighted hope or broken plan. With him whose life stands rounded and approved in the full growth and stature of a man."

—Mrs. Beulah Stewart Moore
20. OctoberTour brochure, October 9 and 10, 2004, cover photo of the Moore House

21. F G S Bryce watercolor of the Seashore Cottage (which resembles his $5000 House)

From House & Garden Magazine

Except for the placement of the side porch, this house built in 1898, is a duplicate of The Moore House. Possibly, architect E.G.W. Dietrich visited The Moore House or saw the plans for the $5000 House in The Art Interchange.
The circa 1899 Hobson Cottage or Gregg House is a Shingle style house two houses south of the Moore House in the Salisbury National Register Historic District (also known as the West Square Local Historic District). It is a two-story frame house with asymmetrical roof, sawtooth shake sheathed central gable, turned porch trim, including spindle frieze. The two-story engaged tower (on the right or north elevation in the photo) has been extensively altered. A one-story veranda extends the length of the front façade curving around to the north elevation. Information provided by Historic Salisbury Foundation and from the 1975 Salisbury National Register Historic District survey.
November 12, 2020

Catherine Garner
Development Services Specialist
132 North Main St.
Salisbury, NC 28145

RE: Proposed Designation of the Moore House, 124 South Ellis St., Salisbury, Rowan County.

Dear Ms. Garner:

Thank you for the report we received on the proposed designation of the Moore House, 124 South Ellis St., Salisbury, Rowan County. We have reviewed the report and offer the following comments in accordance with North Carolina General Statute 160D-946.

According to the report, the Moore House is of local historical importance for its historical association with Beulah Stewart Moore, and because it is an excellent example of Shingle Style design that retains good architectural integrity.

We have shared recommendations with staff to perform changes to the report, but the report overall provides a good, concise history of the building and its association with Beulah Stewart Moore. With the addition of the recommended changes, we believe the designation report will provide the preservation commission and local governing board sufficient information to determine whether the Moore House possesses the requisite special local significance and integrity for local historic landmark designation.

Landmark designation means the community recognizes the property is worthy of preservation because of its special significance to the local community. Any substantial changes in design, materials, and appearance to the property would be subject to the design review procedures of the preservation commission.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the report. Please note, our comments are advisory only and therefore, non-binding. Once the governing board has received a recommendation from the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission, it should proceed in the same manner as would otherwise be required for an amendment to the zoning ordinance. Once the decision has been made, please return a completed copy of the enclosed form to our office.
This letter serves as our comments on the proposed designation of the Moore House. Please contact me at 919-814-6576 should you have any questions about our comments.

Sincerely,

Kristi Brantley  
Local Preservation Commissions/CLG Coordinator

CC: Commission Chair

Enclosure
AN ORDINANCE DESIGNATING THE “MOORE HOUSE”, LOCATED AT 124 SOUTH ELLIS STREET IN SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, AS A HISTORIC LANDMARK

WHEREAS, G.S. § 160D-945 provides for the designation of historic landmarks; and

WHEREAS, the City of Salisbury has created the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission as a commission having the authority to exercise, within the planning jurisdiction of the City, the powers and duties conferred by N.C.G.S. 160D-942; and

WHEREAS, the Moore House is located at 124 South Ellis Street in Salisbury, North Carolina, and is identified by Rowan County Tax Parcel ID No. 010 014 (“the Property”); and

WHEREAS, the Property is currently owned by Jon Planovsky, Trustee of the Planovsky Living Trust, and Robert Lambrecht, Trustee of the Lambrect Living Trust, who have requested and consented to the landmark designation; and

WHEREAS, the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission (the “Commission”) has complied with the applicable provisions of G.S. § 160D-946, and has issued a Landmark Designation Report on February 13, 2020, a copy of which is on file with the Commission and to which reference is made for more specific information, recommending designation of the Property as a historic landmark; and

WHEREAS, as set forth in the Landmark Designation Report, and in accordance with G.S. § 160D-945, the Commission has determined that the Property is of special significance in terms of its historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance, and possesses integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and/or association; and

WHEREAS, the State Historic Preservation Office (“SHPO”) of the North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources has been provided the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed designation; and

WHEREAS, the SHPO reviewed the proposed designation and issued a letter of comment dated November 12, 2020, in which it concluded that the structure “is of local historical importance for its historical association with Beulah Stewart Moore, and because it is an excellent example of Shingle Style design that retains good architectural integrity”; and

WHEREAS, the Commission held a duly-noticed public hearing on December 10, 2020, with respect to this ordinance and designation of the Property as a historic landmark as contemplated herein, and following said hearing voted to recommend that the Salisbury City Council designate the Property as a historic landmark; and

WHEREAS, the Salisbury City Council held a duly-noticed public hearing on January 19, 2021, with respect to this ordinance and designation of the Property as a historic landmark as contemplated herein; and
WHEREAS, the Salisbury City Council, having taken into full consideration all statements and information presented at the public hearings and in the Landmark Designation Report, finds that the Property meets all qualifying elements of a historic landmark, particularly, that it is of special significance in terms of its historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance, and possesses integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and/or association; and

WHEREAS, the Salisbury City Council finds that the Property’s preservation should be encouraged and ensured.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City of Salisbury hereby designates the Moore House, located at 124 South Ellis Street in Salisbury, North Carolina, as a Salisbury Historic Landmark pursuant to G.S. § 160D-945. Said Property being more particularly described as follows:

The Property is generally described as the Moore House, which is a residence on an approximately 0.53-acre lot located at 124 South Ellis Street, Salisbury, Rowan County, North Carolina, identified as Rowan County Tax Parcel ID No. 010 014, and further described in Deed Book 1086, Page 65 of the Rowan County Registry. Those elements of the Property that are protected by and governed in accordance with this Ordinance are: the complete exterior of the house; those portions of the interior of the house as described in the Part 6 of the Landmark Designation Report, which is attached to this Ordinance as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference herein; and the land area of the Property excluding the accessory structures as described in Part 7 of the Landmark Designation Report, which is attached to this Ordinance as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference herein. This property is currently owned by Robert Lambrecht, Trustee of the Lambrecht Living Trust, and Jon Planovsky, Trustee of the Planovsky Living Trust.

SECTION 2. No portion of the interior or exterior features of any building, site, structure, area, or object that is designated in this Ordinance may be altered, restored, moved, remodeled, or reconstructed so that a change in design, material, or outer appearance occurs unless and until a Certificate of Appropriateness is obtained from the Commission or its successors; provided, however, that the City of Salisbury Planning Director or designee may approve Certificates of Appropriateness for minor works as listed in the Salisbury Historic Design Guidelines. The Commission shall review Certificates of Appropriateness for interior alterations using The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

SECTION 3. No portion of the exterior features of any building, site, structure, or object that is designated in this Ordinance may be demolished unless and until a Certificate of Appropriateness is obtained from the Commission or a period of three hundred and sixty-five (365) days has elapsed following final review by the Commission of a request for demolition (or any longer period of time required by G.S. § 160D-949 as it may be amended hereafter); provided, however, that demolition may be denied by the Commission in the event that the State Historic Preservation Officer determines that the building, site, structure, or object has statewide significance as provided by G.S. § 160D-949.
SECTION 4. Nothing in this Ordinance shall be construed to prevent or delay ordinary maintenance or repair of any architectural feature in or on said landmark that does not involve a change in design, material, or outer appearance thereof, nor to prevent or delay the construction, reconstruction, alteration, restoration, demolition or removal of any such feature when a building inspector or similar official certifies to the Commission that such action is required for the public safety because of an unsafe condition. Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the owner of the historic landmark from making any use of the historic landmark not prohibited by other statutes, ordinances, or regulations. Owners of locally designated historic landmarks are expected to be familiar with and follow *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* and the *Salisbury Historic Design Guidelines*, the guidelines used by the Commission to evaluate proposed alterations or additions.

SECTION 5. The Commission shall have no jurisdiction over the interior features of the Property, with the exception of those portions of the interior that are included in the landmark designation by this Ordinance.

SECTION 7. City staff is hereby authorized to have posted on the site herein described a suitable sign indicating that said site has been designated a historic landmark by action of the Commission and the Salisbury City Council; provided, however, should the owners of the Property not consent to the posting of said sign on the Property, City staff is hereby authorized to have the sign located on the public right-of-way adjacent to the Property.

SECTION 8. All owners of the Property whose identity and addresses can be ascertained by the exercise of due diligence, shall be sent by certified mail a copy of this Ordinance.

SECTION 9. Copies of this Ordinance shall be filed and indexed in the offices of the City Clerk, Community Planning Services, Rowan County Register of Deeds, the Rowan County Building Inspector, and the Rowan County Tax Administrator, as required by applicable law.

SECTION 10. In the event any building, site, structure, or object designated in this Ordinance is demolished in accordance with the ordinances of the City of Salisbury, this Ordinance may be repealed.

SECTION 11. Any violation of this Ordinance shall be unlawful as by law provided.

SECTION 12. This Ordinance shall be effective on the date of adoption.
Except for the few changes listed in Modifications, the house interior is as it was in 1892. The ceiling in the grand entranceway is 11 ½'. Flooring is 2 ½” quarter sawn oak. Woodwork throughout is oak with 9” crown molding, 2 ½” chair rail and 8” floor molding. Two 66” pocket doors are here with openings to the front parlor and the rear sitting room. The entrance fireplace has an oak surround with 1 ½” X 6” mottled green American Encaustic tiles in the space between the surrounding and fire box. There is a built-in carved oak window seat and decorative timber fretwork in the turret. At the rear is an oak door with leaded glass transom.

The dramatic switchback staircase has five 9’4” stair treads and two landings. The oak handrail is supported by 20” round oak handrail baluster. Newel posts are boxed with hand-carved sunbursts on three sides with ball finials atop. At the landing are three double hung oak frame windows.

Miss Beulah chose ash woodwork and 5 ¼” heart pine flooring for the front parlor. The bow bay window is described in the east elevation section. Two French doors exit to the side porch. The fireplace here has an oak surround and pale yellow 1 ½” X 6” American Encaustic tiles between firebox and surround. The walls have oak picture rail and crown molding. Twin pocket doors with 7’ span provide entrance to the rear sitting room.

Woodwork in the rear sitting room is cherry with 5 ¼” heart pine flooring. Picture rail and crown molding is identical to the front parlor. The fireplace has an oak surround and mottled brown 1 ½” X 6” American Encaustic tile between firebox and surround. Like the front parlor, double French doors provide an entrance to the side porch.

For the dining room, Miss Beulah chose oak and sycamore and continued the 5 ½” heart pine flooring woodwork from the entranceway to this room. Picture rail, crown molding and waist-high wainscoting and chair rail are on all four walls. The dining room and entranceway fireplaces are of the same material and construction.

Throughout the first floor, the Eastlake hardware including door handles, door and window locks, latches and hinges is original.

A switchback servant staircase with one landing, wood handrails, wood newel posts and square balustrades to the second floor is next to kitchen.

Original recessed window seats are in the second-floor nursery, second floor bathroom and the south bedroom. The Eastlake fireplace surround in the nursery is original.

Four out-buildings are excluded from the landmark status application. First is a 10’ x 10’ wooden shed with one window and swing hinged door is located approximately 30’ from rear property line and on property line to the north. Second is a 10’ x 30’ wooden shed with four windows and double swing doors is situated off the southwest corner of 10’ x 10’ shed approximately 20’ from rear property line. The roofs on both sheds are asphalt shingles which are the same material and color as the house. Third is a 10’ x 12’ temporary aluminum greenhouse situated 2’ from rear property line and 30’ from north property line. The final exclusion is a 4’ x 6’ wood garden folly made from reclaimed materials with one wood window on each of three sides, a wood door on the front and a reclaimed tin shingled roof. It is located 40’ feet from rear property line and 30’ from the north property line.

See Supporting Documentation numbers 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 for photographs of these interior features.
Local Historic Landmark Designation: Tax Implications

The Salisbury City Council is authorized by N.C.G.S. 160A, Part 3C to designate local historic landmarks that are deemed by the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to be of special significance in terms of their historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance; and that possess integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling and/or association.

**Owners of local historic landmarks are eligible for property tax benefits.**

Owners are eligible to apply annually for a 50% property tax deferral as long as the property’s significant historic or architectural features are maintained. N.C.G.S. 105-278 authorizes this benefit:

§ 105-278. Historic properties.

(a) Real property designated as a historic property by a local ordinance adopted pursuant to former G.S. 160A-399.4 or designated as a historic landmark by a local ordinance adopted pursuant to G.S. 160A-400.5 is designated a special class of property under authority of Article V, Sec. 2(2) of the North Carolina Constitution. Property so classified shall be taxed uniformly as a class in each local taxing unit on the basis of fifty percent (50%) of the true value of the property as determined pursuant to G.S. 105-285 and 105-286, or 105-287.

(b) The difference between the taxes due on the basis of fifty percent (50%) of the true value of the property and the taxes that would have been payable in the absence of the classification provided for in subsection (a) shall be a lien on the property of the taxpayer as provided in G.S. 105-355(a). The taxes shall be carried forward in the records of the taxing unit or units as deferred taxes. The deferred taxes for the preceding three fiscal years are due and payable in accordance with G.S. 105-277.1F when the property loses the benefit of this classification as a result of a disqualifying event. A disqualifying event occurs when there is a change in an ordinance designating a historic property or a change in the property, other than by fire or other natural disaster, that causes the property's historical significance to be lost or substantially impaired. In addition to the provisions in G.S. 105-277.1F, no deferred taxes are due and all liens arising under this subsection are extinguished when the property's historical significance is lost or substantially impaired due to fire or other natural disaster. (1977, c. 869, s. 2; 1981, c. 501; 1989, c. 706, s. 3.1; 2005-435, s. 38; 2006-162, s. 28; 2008-35, s. 2.5; 2010-95, s. 17.)

The deferment reduces the taxable value of the property by 50%. This means that any special taxes are also reduced; for example, a landmark property located in a Municipal Service District would see its MSD tax revenue reduced by 50%.

The value of the deferred property taxes are held as a lien against the property. In the event that the property loses landmark status, due to loss or impairment of historical significance or changes in the designating ordinance, the deferred taxes for the previous three years are payable to the owner. If a property loses its historic significance due to a fire or natural disaster, no recapture of past tax deferments will occur.

On the following pages, the tax implications of the designation of example landmarks is provided.
**Example 1: Historic Commercial Building**

- **Value:** $900,000.00
- **Special Taxes:**
  - Located in Municipal Service District
- **Tax Rates:**
  - City Tax Rate: 0.7196%
  - MSD Tax Rate: 0.176%
- **Pre-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years**
  - Taxable Value: $900,000.00
  - City Revenue: $64,764.00
  - MSD Revenue: $15,840.00
- **Post-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years**
  - **50% REDUCTION IN TAXABLE VALUE**
  - Taxable Value: $450,000.00
  - City Revenue: $32,382.00
  - MSD Revenue: $7,920.00

*The designation of this property would reduce the City’s revenue by $40,302.00 over 10 years.*

**Example 2: Large Historic Residence**

- **Value:** $1,200,000.00
- **Special Taxes:** N/A
- **Tax Rates:**
  - City Tax Rate: 0.7196%
- **Pre-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years**
  - Taxable Value: $1,200,000.00
  - City Revenue: $86,352.00
- **Post-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years**
  - **50% REDUCTION IN TAXABLE VALUE**
  - Taxable Value: $600,000.00
  - City Revenue: $43,176.00

*The designation of this property would reduce the City’s revenue by $43,176.00 over 10 years.*
**Example 3: Modest Historic Residence**

- Value: $350,000.00
- Special Taxes: N/A
- Tax Rates:
  - City Tax Rate: 0.7196%
- Pre-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years
  - Taxable Value: $350,000.00
  - City Revenue: $25,186.00
- Post-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years
  - 50% REDUCTION IN TAXABLE VALUE
    - Taxable Value: $175,000.00
    - City Revenue: $12,593.00

*The designation of this property would reduce the City’s revenue by $12,186.00 over 10 years.*

**Additional Resources:**
Requested Council Meeting Date: 01/19/2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request: Community Planning Services

Name of Presenter(s): Catherine Garner

Requested Agenda Item: Council to hold a public hearing and consider adoption of an ordinance designating the “Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House,” located at 619 S Main Street in Salisbury, North Carolina, as a Local Historic Landmark.

Description of Requested Agenda Item: NCGS 160D-945 authorizes the governing body of municipalities to designate historic landmarks that are deemed and found by the Historic Preservation Commission to be of special significance in terms of its historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance and to possess integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and/or association.

On August 20, 2020 the Historic Preservation Commission received a Local Historic Landmark (LHL) pre-application from Historic Salisbury Foundation, owner/applicant, and Karen Lilly-Bowyer, agent. The Commission found that the property may meet the requirements of LHL designation. The applicant prepared the attached LHL report, which was submitted to the NC State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for review and comment, per NCGS 160D-946. The SHPO submitted a response on October 30, 2020, which included suggested changes to the document for clarity. On December 10, 2020, the Historic Preservation Commission received a final Local Historic Landmark application from the property owner and agent. The Commission found that the property has special significance for its architectural and cultural importance and that it retains most aspects of its integrity. The Commission voted 6-0 (2 absent, 1 recused) to recommend approval of the LHL application to City Council.

The N. B. McCanless House is not located within a historic district but was individually listed on the National Register in 2014. If approved, this would be the fifth LHL; the third outside of a National Register district.

Attachments: Yes No

Fiscal Note: (If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item: (Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition) Council to hold a public hearing and consider adoption of an ordinance designating the “Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House,” located at 619 S Main Street in Salisbury, North Carolina, as a Local Historic Landmark.

Contact Information for Group or Individual: Catherine Garner, catherine.garner@salisburync.gov; 704-638-5212
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

☐ Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)

☒ Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________   _____________________________
Finance Manager Signature     Department Head Signature

_________________________________
Budget Manager Signature

****All agenda items must be submitted at least 7 days before the requested Council meeting date***

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved      ☐ Delayed      ☐ Declined

Reason:
Case #: HL-01-2020
Case Staff: Catherine Garner

Owner(s): Historic Salisbury Foundation, Inc.
Applicant(s): Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer
Authorized Agent(s): Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer

LOCATION
District: N/A
Building: Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House (RW #0998)
Street: 619 S Main Street
Tax Parcel #: 015 397

BUILDING DESCRIPTION:
Classification: Individually Listed
Year Built: Ca. 1897
Style: Second Empire
Project Type: Local Historic Landmark Pre-Application

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF CATEGORIES A. THROUGH D. FOR LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS:
When individually listed on the National Register in 2013, the house was only found to have significance under Criterion B.

Based upon the pre-application submitted, the applicant is proposing that the N. B. McCanless House is significant under Criterion B and Criterion C.

B. Properties that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

C. Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/ELEMENTS:
Please refer to the information provided with the application.

LOCAL LANDMARK CRITERIA:
Per G. S. 160D-945, no property shall be recommended for designation as a historic landmark unless it is deemed and found by the preservation commission to be of special significance in terms of its
historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance and to possess integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling and/or association.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

**Special Significance**
- This property’s special significance is for its cultural importance as the home of Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless. Mr. McCanless was a local entrepreneur with heavy involvement in the organization, funding, and/or building of an extraordinary number of ventures, including several local cotton mills, the local granite industry, particularly Harris Granite Company, several banks, and various commercial developments downtown. His interests were in industry and commerce and transportation related projects that supported the two (NR pgs. 15-16)

**Integrity**
- **Design** – The exterior of the N. B. McCanless House retains excellent integrity in terms of design. The house is clad in rusticated ashlar granite blocks over load-bearing brick walls. The use of granite is continued in the narrow bands of granite blocks as a string course at the window sill and lintel height on the first story, and at window sill height and beneath the cornice on the second story. The most distinguishing design feature of this property could be considered the third story mansard roof with decorative slate shingles. These features of the house are not changed from the time of construction.

While it has remained a wrap-around porch, the porch has been altered over the years with portions removed. In addition, the National Register nomination discusses several instances where original design features have either been removed, altered, or are of unknown integrity. In addition, a rear elevation fire escape has been added that detracts from the integrity of the design overall, though less impactful than if the stairs were located on a side or front elevation.

The interior of the structure has greatly suffered in the original design over the years, as different owners have completed various remodeling efforts. Staff finds that the interior should not be included, except for specific, identifiable features. Those specific, identifiable features have not been detailed by the applicant in their pre-application.

- **Setting** – The house sits on a relatively level parcel that has not been subdivided or otherwise changed in size since the house’s construction. The existing railroad bed and National Cemetery to the east remain from the time of construction. Main Street is likely to have changed over the years as traffic demands shifted from trolley to individual automobiles. The residential buildings that surrounded this house are largely gone with the exception of two that remain from the period of significance that have since been converted to commercial uses. The house does not readily retain its integrity of setting as a structure in a residential transition area from the commercial core; the commercial pressures of South Main have overtaken the residential nature of the area.

- **Workmanship** – The house possesses a high degree of integrity in the workmanship category. The rusticated ashlar granite blocks that make up the cladding for both the house and the kitchen accessory building and the chimney material was locally hewn and is representative of Rowan County granite. Mr. N. B. McCanless was an investor in several granite companies, which influenced the type of construction for his personal residence.
• **Materials** – The locally hewn granite on both the primary structure and the accessory kitchen structure retains its integrity, as well as the slate shingles on the Mansard roof. However, the integrity of the materials has been compromised by the incongruous vinyl window replacement for the majority of the building, the rear first floor entrance door replacement, and conversion of several rear elevation windows to doors. Window and doors are important aspects of a historic structure. Though in large part, the fenestration pattern remains the same, the material change significantly detracts from the overall integrity of the site.

• **Feeling** – According to the National Register report, “the house conveys the feeling of a late-nineteenth/early-twentieth century house in an urban setting with easy access to granite quarries in the area (NR pg. 11). While staff finds that it is still an urban setting, the commercial growth from both ends of South Main Street have changed the area surrounding the house from a primarily residential area at the edge of a commercial district to that of a commercial district.

• **Association** – Despite alterations to the porch and the original windows, the house has not suffered extensive additions or façade changes that impact the overall look of the house. It sufficiently retains its association with Mr. N. B. McCanless.

Staff finds that the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless house retains its special significance under Criterion B for Mr. McCanless’ contributions to the City of Salisbury’s industrial growth and development as well as residential development in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Staff finds that the house suffers in some areas of its integrity, but wholly retain integrity in its exterior design, workmanship, feeling, and association.

**PRE-APPLICATION DECISION**

Based upon the staff recommendation, the Commission approved the Local Historic Landmark pre-application for the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless house (Parcel ID 015 397) as the property may be found to qualify as a Local Historic Landmark.

**SHPO COMMENT**

The report was submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for their review and comment period as required by NCGS 160D-946. On October 30, 2020, SHPO’s response was received and provided by staff to the applicant and their agent. SHPO and the Office of State Archaeology concur that there is the potential for archaeological remains on site, and care should be taken to avoid disturbance if future ground-disturbing activities are planned. The reviewers made a suggestion to the applicant and their agent about strengthening the integrity discussion and it has been incorporated into the final report, attached.

**HPC: ACTION ON THE LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARK APPLICATION**

The HPC held a public hearing at their December 10, 2020 regular meeting. The Commission reviewed the final report, SHPO comment letter, and staff report. Ms. Karen Lilly-Bowyer spoke on behalf of the application. The Commission voted unanimously of members present to find that the property exhibits special significance and integrity and to recommend approval of the designation to City Council.
LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARK APPLICATION

FILING DATE: ___________________________  □ WITHIN A LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT  □ INDIVIDUALLY LISTED ON NATIONAL REGISTER
CASE NUMBER: ___________________________

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Rowan County Parcel ID(s): 015 397
Address: 619 S Main Street Salisbury, NC 28144
Historic Name of Property: Napoleon Bonaparte McCants House
Date of Original Construction: 1897  Date of Alterations: 1970s, 1980s, 1990s
National Register District: No  Local Historic District: No
Individually listed on National Register: Yes RW0998  Year Listed: 2014

OWNER INFORMATION

Property Owner: Historic Salisbury Foundation
Address: P.O. Box 4221 Salisbury, NC 28145
Email: director@historicsalisbury.org  Phone: 704.636.0103

APPLICATION AGENT INFORMATION

Name: Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer
Address: 1104 Statesville Blvd. Salisbury, NC 28144
Email: kimb@bowyer.com  Phone: 704.213.4232

SIGNATURE

I, the undersigned, certify that the preceding information is correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the submission of this application does not guarantee the approval as a local historic landmark.

To the best of my knowledge, the property is not subject to any federal, state, or local regulatory agency restrictions. Any statements made herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

I understand that if approved, the property becomes bound by the Historic District Design Guidelines for all future changes.

I am aware that Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) members, or staff, may enter upon private land at reasonable times to inspect the work or the site solely in performance of their duties.

Owner(s): ______________________________
Applicant: Historic Salisbury Foundation - Sade Stewart
Application Last Revised: MARCH, 2020
APPLICATION NARRATIVE

This application initiates consideration of a property for local historic landmark status. Submittal of this application does not mean that a property is being designated as a local historic landmark at this time, nor does the submittal of this application guarantee designation.

This portion of the application will be reviewed by staff and the NC State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), who will render comments on the property proposed for designation. Upon return of the SHPO’s comments, the Salisbury HPC will hold a public hearing to determine if this property meets the special significance and integrity criteria as outlined in the information materials and make a recommendation to City Council. City Council will also hold a public hearing on the item. City Council makes the final decision on whether a property is designated as a landmark. They can approve the request as submitted, as amended, or deny the proposed landmark.

Please carefully consider the attached checklist. This information is the minimum required to determine whether a property could be evaluated as a local historic landmark. If a National Register nomination is being utilized as part of this application, consider the age. The architectural description may need to be rewritten to document changes to the structure. This narrative must be typed. All submitted materials become the property of the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission and cannot be returned.

Initials of owner(s): [Signature] Initials of agent: [Signature]
I. General Information
   1. Common Name: Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House
   2. Location: 619 South Main Street, Salisbury, NC
   3. Tax parcel ID: 015 397
   4. Owner: Historic Salisbury Foundation
   5. Owner Address: PO BOX 4221, Salisbury, NC 28145
   6. Appraised Tax Value: $269,360.00

II. Abstract
   1. The McCanless House was built in 1897 by Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless, a prodigious Salisbury entrepreneur, who made significant contributions to industry and commerce in Salisbury during the late 1800s and early 1900s. His efforts at promoting the material prosperity of Salisbury and Rowan County helped shape the character of those places. McCanless’s had a leading role in the organization, funding and or building of the following ventures: Vance Cotton Mill, Kesler Cotton Mill, North Side Roller Mill, Doggins/Coggin Mines Company, Yadkin Finishing Company, Harris Granite Company, Salisbury Savings Bank, Peoples National Bank, Morris Plan Company (later Security Bank and Trust Company), the Washington Building, Central Hotel, and the Empire Block and Hotel. The house was recognized in 2014 by the National Register of Historic Places under criterion B as the home of an important local citizen. The Historic Salisbury Foundation is requesting local Historic Landmark designation to add a city level protection for this important historic property. The property is significant to Salisbury history under criteria B and C (architecture). The property is located in an area of Salisbury that is likely to have significant commercial development in the future. It is appropriate for Salisbury and the city’s pride in its historical past to help support the preservation of this significant property.

   2. The main house and the semi-attached kitchen building as well as the 0.378 acres are to be included in the designation. The land included in the request is the legal parcel and it is representative of the land that is historically associated with the home. Because of the age of the property and the use of materials in the 1800s it is possible that there may be some archeological significance to the land.

   Only the exterior of the house is to be included in the local designation. The few remaining character defining features of the Colonial Revival style interior are to be preserved through covenants that Historic Salisbury Foundation will establish before the property is sold.

   House Interior

   Local designation of the house interior is not being requested. The interior has lost most of its integrity due to multiple ownership and attempts to modernize. However, there
are a few significant features that remain. There are several elaborate mantles, door and window surrounds, stairs and balustrades. The south parlor has reed picture frame molding and a unique semicircular wall. These features will be retained by the Historic Salisbury Foundation if they complete interior restoration. If the property is sold, these features will be protected by covenants.

III. Historical Background

1. Salisbury, North Carolina, established in 1755 as the seat of the newly-formed Rowan County, developed as western North Carolina’s first center of transportation, trade, and political activity. The town grew at a steady pace until the 1850s, when it experienced a notably prosperous decade. From 1850 to 1860, Salisbury’s population more than doubled. The Civil War, however, brought growth largely to a halt and, like most places in the South, Salisbury spent the decades following the war recovering and shoring up its economic base for further growth. By the mid-1880s, increased rail traffic was largely responsible for the renewed blossoming of Salisbury’s commerce and industry, and the decades between 1880 and 1930 were especially prosperous years for the town. It was during that period that Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless (1851-1920) often referred to as N.B. McCanless, settled in Salisbury around 1888 and exercised his considerable entrepreneurial skills to the betterment of the town and county until his death.

Typical of entrepreneurship of the time, most of McCanless’s ventures included other investors and/or partners, but mostly it was McCanless who had the vision and know-how to guide the projects to success. Between at least 1891 and 1917, McCanless had leading roles in the organization, funding, and/or building of an extraordinary number of ventures. In industry, these included the Vance Cotton Mill, the Kesler Cotton Mill, the North Side Roller Mill, the Doggin (or Coggin) Mines Company, the Yadkin Finishing Company, and the granite industry, particularly the Harris Granite Company. In commerce, his ventures included the Salisbury Savings Bank, the Peoples National Bank, a Morris Plan Company bank (later Security Bank and Trust Company), the Washington Building, the Central Hotel, and the Empire Block and Hotel. His efforts at residential development and construction centered on the south part of Salisbury, where he lived, and included buying and platting land, laying out of Thomas Street, and building numerous houses. Transportation projects included macadamizing some of Salisbury’s streets, the Salisbury Electric Light and Street Railway Company, the Spencer Street Railway, and the Salisbury-Monroe Railroad. In 1891, McCanless was the primary mover in the organization of the Vance Cotton Mill in Salisbury. Among others involved were D. R. Julian, Dr. C. M. Van Poole, E. B. Neave, Rev.F. J. Murdoch, Julius Lineberger, and Dave Atwell. In addition to organizing the mill, McCanless built and equipped it and operated it for a time. The mill used Egyptian long-staple cotton in the spinning of fine combed yarns. Under various names, it remained in operation until 2001. In December of the following year, the mill was destroyed by fire. When the Kesler Cotton Mill (within NRHD, 1985; demolished), named for largest stockholder Tobias Kesler, was organized in Salisbury in 1895, N. B. McCanless made the brick for the mill’s construction and then built and equipped
the mill. After Kesler, McCanless was at the head of the list of investors, which also included D. R. Julian, O. D. Davis, and the Rev. Francis Johnstone Murdoch. In 1899, J. W. Cannon took control of the Kesler Cotton Mill, and in 1928 it consolidated with other mills to become the Cannon Mills Company. Known then as Cannon Mill #7, it remained in operation until 2000.

In 1896-1897, N. B. McCanless and D. R. Julian built and equipped the North Side Roller Mill (NR, 1984; burned 1/2013) and operated it successfully for two years. It was one of the first roller mills in Rowan County. Other investors in the mill were N. B. McCanless’s brother, James C. McCanless, and his brother-in-law, Adolphus C. Mauney. For most of its history, from 1906 until 1963, the mill was known as Grimes Mill for the Grimes family who operated it during those years. This significant late-nineteenth-century mill was architecturally impressive as the only Second Empire-style industrial building in Salisbury, characterized by its substantial three-story, three-bay-wide and four-bay-deep brick form, granite corner quoins and other trim, and steep mansard roof with gabled dormers.

The son of Joseph and Catherine (Wasson) McCanless, Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless was born in 1851 around fifteen miles southeast of Salisbury in the Gold Hill community of Rowan County. His early adulthood reads like that of many young men searching for their place in life. When he was fourteen, he attempted to enlist in Wheeler’s Cavalry of the Confederate army, but was unsuccessful. Soon after the end of the Civil War, he left Gold Hill to pursue opportunities elsewhere. First he moved to Salisbury, hoping to establish himself there. For nearly three years he worked as a clerk in the firm of McCubbins, Foster and Company and its successor. McCanless then left Salisbury for New York, where he worked for his brother, William L. McCanless, in the firm of McCanless and Burrell. After his brother’s death (date unknown), McCanless traveled to the new settlement of Wichita, Kansas. There he worked in the construction department of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad. However, he remained in Wichita only one year, after which he returned to Gold Hill.6

In Gold Hill, McCanless worked for one year for Amos Howe, who had purchased a mine there. When the North Carolina Reduction Company purchased the mine, McCanless continued on with them for another year. Following that, he fulfilled a contract to haul granite for the Federal Building (NR, 1971) in Raleigh. Apparently, during his years in Gold Hill, McCanless was also a farmer, for he was listed as such in the 1880 U. S. Census. In 1872, McCanless married Georgia Frances Mauney, daughter of Ephraim and Rachel (McMackin) Mauney of Gold Hill. They soon began their family of eleven children, nine of whom survived to adulthood.

Exactly when the McCanlesses moved to Salisbury is not known. However, until at least 1885, the McCanless children were born in Gold Hill. On August 13, 1888, Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless purchased 4.7 acres from William H. Horah on South Main Street, and the following year he transferred the same property to his wife, Georgia. This tract became the McCanlesses’ homeplace for the remainder of their
lives. They first lived in a commodious two-story frame house that is shown in an early photograph of the first alignment of Military Avenue east from South Main Street. Apparently, however, McCanless was already having dreams of erecting a more prestigious dwelling, as reported in the June 5, 1890, issue of the Carolina Watchman. According to the paper, McCanless proposed building a “handsomer residence” for himself on Southwest Main Street “below his present home.” The paper reported that the new house would be “a feature of that end of the street.” Nevertheless, seven years passed before McCanless built his new house.

On August 13, 1888, N. B. McCanless purchased a tract of nearly five acres on South Main Street that became the McCanless homeplace. In 1897 he erected an impressive three-story, Second Empire-style, brick house faced with ashlar-cut, rusticated granite blocks. The house was the perfect expression of McCanless’s growing status in the community and of his long-time, prominent association with the granite industry. It was and remains unique in Salisbury as the town’s only Second Empire house faced entirely with granite block. Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless was a prodigious entrepreneur during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries whose efforts at promoting the material prosperity of Salisbury and Rowan County helped shape the character of those places. Upon McCanless’s death, his obituary labeled him “a great builder” and asserted that he was “doubtless identified with more enterprises than any other man of this county of any age.” McCanless’s interests were broad, but focused on commerce.

The distinctive granite house at 619 South Main Street that Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless built in 1897 served as his residence throughout most of his productive years in Salisbury until his death. The architectural character of the house reflects McCanless’s prominent role in the community as well as his ties to the local granite industry. During the second half of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first century, after the house had left McCanless family ownership, it was alternately neglected and mistreated.

Nevertheless, the bold granite exterior remains largely intact and the primary distinctive features of the interior survive to provide the house with sufficient historic integrity. The Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House meets Criterion B for listing in the National Register as the primary property associated with the productive life of entrepreneur Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless in Salisbury and Rowan County, North Carolina. His earlier frame house, also located on South Main Street, no longer stands. The nominated house is locally significant due to McCanless’s leading roles in the areas of commerce and industry, and its period of significance spans the years from the construction of the house in 1897 to McCanless’s death in 1920.1

According to the August 25, 1897, edition of the Salisbury Truth.16 Like the North Side Roller Mill, McCanless’s house was a substantial three-story building that was three bays wide and four bays deep. A fine representative of the Second Empire style, it was

---

built with a steep mansard roof with gabled dormers like the mill. But whereas the mill was a brick structure with granite trim, the house was a brick structure fully clad in rusticated granite blocks – the only house in Salisbury that could claim that distinction. Reflecting McCanless’s growing status in the community, the house instantly became a landmark in Salisbury and an anchor to the south end of Main Street. The interior of the house continued the stylishness of the exterior, but reflected the Colonial Revival style rather than the Second Empire style. When McCanless built the house that served as his and his wife, Georgia’s, homeplace for the rest of their lives, it housed all of their children within its three floors. At the time, they ranged in age from two to twenty-three. Although the three oldest, who were nineteen, twenty-one, and twenty-three, could typically have left home by that time. They were daughters Lena, Mary, and Carrie, respectively, who did not marry until 1904, 1902, and 1906, again respectively. The U. S. Census for 1900 reported that all nine children were still living at home at the turn of the century. Carrie and Lena were teachers and, interestingly, despite N. B. McCanless’s numerous entrepreneurial ventures, he was listed as superintendent of a granite quarry. So, McCanless’s house reflected not only his status in the community, but also his association with the local granite industry. It served as an advertisement of sorts for granite, demonstrating how the material could be used to great effect in residential construction.

As the nineteenth century came to a close, McCanless expanded his entrepreneurial attentions to other aspects of Salisbury’s economy. The following reflects his broad range of interests, especially in banking, commercial investment and construction, residential construction and development, and transportation-related projects that supported Salisbury’s commerce and industry.

In 1899, N. B. McCanless and D. R. Julian organized the Salisbury Savings Bank and erected a building for it at the corner of North Main and West Council Streets (replaced in 1926 by the Salisbury City Hall). In 1903 they organized the Peoples National Bank, and McCanless served as its president. When, in 1915, a group of Salisbury businessmen started a Morris Plan Company bank to provide a much-needed installment loan service for the people of Salisbury, McCanless was one of the directors. In 1945, the institution’s name changed to Security Bank and Trust Company.

McCanless engaged in additional commercial investments and construction. Around 1890, he joined with Lee Overman, D. R. Julian, and C. L. Welch to construct the Washington Building, located at 118-120 North Main Street. The three-story brick building has a rusticated granite façade with expansive round-arched windows and rich detailing that is a notable example of the Richardsonian Romanesque style in Salisbury. The use of a stone façade was an exception to the more typical brick facades along Main Street and reflected the development of the granite quarries in Rowan County.

In 1906, McCanless purchased three-eighths of the Central Hotel (later the Empire Hotel) stock from a New Jersey investor. There were two other owners of the hotel: his brother, J. C. McCanless, and J. S. McCubbins.
According to a biographical sketch, N. B. McCanless, along with his son-in-law J. D. Norwood, J. C. Welch, and J. S. McCubbins, erected the Empire Block, which included the Empire Hotel and several stores. The Empire Hotel had been built in the 1850s as the Boyden House, but around 1907, it was remodeled and extensively expanded to include a row of stores according to plans prepared by prominent architect Frank P. Milburn. It was likely these plans that McCanless and his associates executed. The rather baroque façade of this immense and richly detailed building gains much of its visual power from its contrasting use of red and cream brick. McCanless was one of the largest stockholders and an officer of the Empire Block company. On December 18, 1909, fire damaged the building and threatened the whole block. However, except for a section of the roof on the second floor that collapsed, the building as a whole survived remarkably intact. In January 1910, McCanless disposed of his financial interest in the company and retired as its president.

McCanless was also involved in residential development and construction. He purchased a large tract of land in the southern part of Salisbury, near his home. He platted Thomas Street and built many private residences. McCanless’s grandson, Carl Hammer Jr., wrote that at their house on South Main Street, his grandparents were surrounded by their sons and daughters and their families as well as by other relatives. Presumably McCanless was responsible for the construction of some, if not all, of their houses.

McCanless’s entrepreneurial activities extended to transportation-related ventures intended to improve the quality of life in Salisbury and also support the town’s economy. Around 1895, McCanless and two of his frequent business partners, D. R. Julian and J. S. McCubbins, were awarded a $50,000 contract to macadamize some of Salisbury’s streets. Prior to that time, the streets had not been improved, and many were in deplorable condition.

On January 9, 1905, an article in the Salisbury Evening Post reported on the progress of Salisbury’s new streetcar line. According to N. B. McCanless, who was president of the Salisbury Electric Light and Street Railway Company, construction of the power house was nearly complete, a big engine was on its way from Providence, Rhode Island, and the cars would be running by no later than March 15 of that year. The track was to be extended a short distance from the Spencer terminal at the north end of Salisbury, and as soon as the line was in operation, the rail was to be extended to Chestnut Hill at the south end of Salisbury. In partnership with Thomas H. Vanderford, McCanless built and equipped the Spencer Street Railway, but it is possible that the two rail lines were part of a single entity.

In 1911, a railroad was proposed between Salisbury and Monroe, a town approximately sixty miles south of Salisbury in Union County. N. B. McCanless was vice president of the Salisbury-Monroe Railroad, also called the Salisbury Railroad Company, and was called its moving spirit. McCanless and another promoter, W. H. Ragland, traveled
to Concord and Monroe to promote the railroad, but whether they succeeded in getting bonds passed to pay for the road’s construction is not known.

On a more personal note, but not surprising given McCanless’s status and interest in transportation, he owned an automobile by at least 1912. Apparently, it was newsworthy enough for the Salisbury Evening Post to report that McCanless went to Cabarrus County to retrieve his automobile, which was there awaiting repairs after a slight wreck.

During the 1910s, McCanless’s last decade of life, newspaper reports chronicled his continued involvement with area industries. In 1910, McCanless’s name was the first in a list of several incorporators of the Doggin (or Coggin) Mines Company of Salisbury, when it was chartered with an authorized capital of $100,000.

Harkening back to McCanless’s earlier interest in textile manufacturing, in 1916 he was one of a group of primary stockholders, among whom were his son, William A. McCanless, and his son-in-law, J. D. Norwood, who incorporated the Yadkin Finishing Company and erected a riverside mill. The purpose of the company was to prepare damask cloth from regional mills for market so that they would not have to be sent to finishing firms in the North.

Among the multitude of industrial and commercial ventures and transportation-related projects with which N. B. McCanless was involved during his career, perhaps his greatest single association was with Rowan County’s granite industry. While the 1890 U.S. Census population schedule for Rowan County is not available, the 1900 Census lists his occupation as “superintendent granite quarry.” The Harris Granite Company was incorporated in 1910, and by 1912, N. B. McCanless was listed as president, a position he held until at least 1917. The company had quarries in three locations in North Carolina in addition to Salisbury – Wilson County, Henderson County, and Rockingham County. The production volume was substantial. In a single month in 1912, the company shipped 447 car loads of stone – more than 20,000 tons – valued at nearly $50,000. This included gray and pink, or Balfour, granite in blocks, crushed, and ballast forms. According to the Industrial Edition of the Salisbury Evening Post in 1912, granite was one of the chief assets of Rowan County. The compressive strength of the granite was 50,000 pounds per square inch, as compared with 20,000 pounds per square inch for the granite produced at the North Carolina Granite Corporation Quarry (NR, 1980) outside Mount Airy. The granite had many uses, among which were crushed stone and paving blocks for road work, crushed stone for concrete building, and block stone for buildings and monuments. The Harris Granite Company also had a finishing plant in Salisbury, reported to be the largest in the South, for the manufacture of monuments and mausoleums. The building stone and monuments were shipped to all parts of the United States.

Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless died on January 27, 1920, at the age of sixty-eight. McCanless’s obituary and a tribute written by James F. Hurley Sr., editor of the
Salisbury Post, summarize the considerable contributions he made to Salisbury and to Rowan County. His obituary labeled him “A Great Builder,” “one who worked by day and dreamed and planned by night.” The obituary continued, “He was always promoting the material prosperity of the county. He was no doubt identified with more enterprises than any other man of this county of any age. Much of Salisbury of today is due in very large measure to Mr. McCanless’ activities and interest. Manufacture, mining, quarrying, banking, and other activities owe much to his guiding hand and wisdom.” Hurley’s editorial tribute added that “In the city stand monuments to his genius, his faith, his vision and his fidelity. Spindles hum because of his energies. Streets and buildings which were the inspirations of his mind and tangible evidence of his wisdom and achievement remain to bless mankind. Covering many years, he wrought heroicly [sic] and left ample physical evidence of the practicability of his planning.”

N. B. McCanless’s grandson, Carl Hammer Jr., wrote in 1974 that his grandfather acquired a considerable reputation for financial acumen, but that there was a general belief that he was far wealthier than he ever became in actuality. The reality of this played out after McCanless’s death. His widow, Georgia Frances (Mauney) McCanless, continued to live in the family home on South Main Street until her death in 1940. However, in 1932, Mrs. McCanless did not have sufficient funds or personal property to satisfy a debt to creditor North Carolina Bank and Trust Company. As a result, the house and associated lot were sold by the Sheriff to the North Carolina Bank and Trust Company. Excepted from the deed was the homestead allotted to Mrs. McCanless. That “homestead” consisted of two rooms and a bath on the first floor of the south side of the stone residence, across the hall from the dining room. The rooms were additionally described as being the second and third rooms from the front of the house measuring approximately fifteen-feet square and nine-and-a-half-feet square, respectively, with an adjoining bathroom opening to the hall. At present, the two rooms described in the deed have been converted to one room behind the parlor. Mrs. McCanless was also allowed ingress and egress from the front of the house.

At some point – a deed could not be found – the house was transferred to Ralph L. Lewis and his wife, Laura L. W. Lewis, and Huger S. King and his wife, Mary Lynn C. King, all of Guilford County. In 1939, they conveyed the property to R. E. Gambill, but the excepted homestead for Mrs. McCanless remained in effect until her death on April 10, 1940.

On April 28, 1950, R. E. Gambill conveyed the property to his former wife, Esther Gambill McKown of York County, South Carolina. During the McKown ownership, the house was leased to a Mrs. Patterson, who operated a nursing home in it. In 1984, W. W. McKown of Chester County, South Carolina, along with his two daughters and their husbands, sold the property to Charles Kim Major of Kannapolis, North Carolina. The following year, Major conveyed one-half interest in the property to Donald R. Bennett, also of Kannapolis. During their ownership, the house was used as a restaurant. In 1988, Major and Bennett sold the property to James T. and Barbara M. Rusher, who also used the house as a restaurant. In 1990, the property was foreclosed.
and sold at auction to Home Federal Savings Bank. The following year, Rowan Homes, Inc., a non-profit organization providing services for developmentally disabled people in Rowan County, purchased the property to use for their offices and a learning center. In 2004, Rowan Homes, Inc. sold the property to William Peeler Raykes of Davidson County, North Carolina, and on November 29, 2011, Raykes sold the property to Livingstone College. In 2019, the college sold the property to the Historic Salisbury Foundation. During the second half of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first Century, the frequent changes in ownership of the property and the various uses to which the house was put were, overall, not kind to it. Still, the exterior of the house remains remarkably intact, and many distinctive features of the interior survive.

Historic Salisbury Foundation is currently working to stabilize the property while respecting its important historic character.

(Specific documentation for III Historical Background, can be found in the National Register of historic Places Nomination reference # 14000264)

2. The house was built in 1897 by Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless. As his family home. The architect is not known.

3. Additions and Alterations

Exterior: Physical evidence indicates that the porch once wrapped around the northeast corner to the rear of the house. That portion was removed an unknown date. The portion of the porch that remains is remarkably intact.

Interior: The interior has suffered numerous alterations to accommodate business that have occupied the structure. Specific documentation of alterations does not exist. Fortunately, several mantles and fireplaces, door and window surrounds, the round wall in the front right parlor as well as the front and back stairs were spared. The following businesses made changes to the interior:

   Circa 1950 A nursing Home rented the property:
   (alterations to interior walls)
   Circa 1985 A restaurant occupied the property
   (added fire escape steps and alterations to the kitchen)³
   Circa 1990 Rowan Holmes used the property for offices.
   (specific changes are unknown)

2019-2020 Historic Salisbury Foundation cleaned the property which

---

³ Clement, Interview 2020.
had apparently become a refuge for homeless individuals. The slate roof was inspected and received maintenance. Broken windows were replaced. The general condition of the house and yard have been cleaned.

IV. Assessment

1. The property is significant under criterion B as the home of one of Salisbury’s most prodigious entrepreneurs in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. His efforts to promote the material prosperity of Salisbury and Rowan County helped to shape the character of those places. The property is also significant under criterion C as an intact Second Empire residence, and unique to Salisbury and Rowan County for the use of locally quarried granite.

2. Architectural Description Exterior:

The Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House is a rectangular dwelling – three bays wide and four bays deep – with a rounded tower at the southwest corner. It has a brick foundation, and the first two stories have load-bearing brick walls faced entirely with rusticated ashlar granite blocks. Laid in parallel courses, the large rectangular blocks vary in length. Adding visual interest to the regularity of the walls, narrow bands of granite blocks form string courses at window sill and lintel height on the first story and, on the second story, at window sill height and immediately beneath the cornice. Refined, beaded, mortar joints hold the granite blocks together. Above the granite walls, a steep, concave, mansard roof sheathed in decorative slate shingles holds the third story. In line with the windows of the first two stories, dormers with steep gable roofs project from the mansard roof. The sides and roof slopes of the dormers are sheathed with slate shingles, but the gables themselves are weather boarded. Like the eaves beneath the mansard roof, the gable eaves are boxed and molded wood. Two chimneys rise from the mansard roof. One is an interior end chimney on the north side, and the other is an interior chimney on the south side. Both chimneys are granite, but the blocks are of one size and are smaller than those used on the body of the house.

For the most part, the house has replacement, vinyl-framed windows. However, the windows match the one-over-one sash configuration of the original windows. Three façade windows provide exceptions. Original windows are located in the north bay adjacent to the entrance. The central windows on the tower’s first and second stories are also original. Each consists of a single, large, fixed pane surmounted by a narrow, rectangular pane. The two parts of each window are separated by a granite lintel/sill. Another exception to the one-over-one sash is a rectangular opening in the north, first-story bay at the rear of the house. Now covered on both exterior and interior with plywood, it contained a sliding-glass window that provided a pass-through from the kitchen in the outbuilding to the dining room in the house.

The main entrance to the house, in the façade’s center bay, is a wood door with two wood panels in the bottom half and an oval glass in the top half. At the rear of the house, the center-bay entrance has been replaced with an institutional metal door with
a glass pane in the upper half. Above the rear entrance, the center-bay windows of the
second and third stories have been replaced with the same type of institutional doors.
A fixed, metal, fire escape leads downward and to the north from the third-floor
entrance, then turns south, connecting with the second-floor landing, continues south
from there nearly to the south end of the house, and then turns eastward and continues
to the ground. The fire escape dates from the last quarter of the twentieth century.
There are no entrances on the north and south sides of the house, whose four bays are
characterized by three stories of vertically-aligned windows.

One of the most distinctive exterior features of the house is the wraparound porch,
which runs from the west bay on the south side of the house, around the tower, across
the rest of the façade, and down three bays of the north side. Sanborn maps and
physical evidence on the stonework reveal that originally the porch continued along
the north half of the rear of the house, providing a sheltered connection between the
house and the kitchen, and then turned east and ran along the south side of the
outbuilding. However, whether the rear section of the porch was constructed of the
granite features of the rest of the porch or was a simpler frame structure, and whether
or not it actually connected with the kitchen building are unanswered questions. The
surviving porch has slender, tapered, rusticated granite posts that rest on two-block granite bases. Between the posts is a rusticated granite balustrade, which is repeated
around the flat roof of the tower, but with the addition of widely spaced dentils beneath
the balustrade. The bottom rail of the porch balustrade rests on the ground, except on
the south side of the house, where the land slopes slightly downward to the east. There,
the balustrade rests on uncoursed granite blocks, and two granite steps access the east
end of the porch.

Currently, the porch floor is composed of concrete panels of unknown date. Although
the appearance and material of the original floor is not certain, it is likely that it was
poured concrete over a brick base. At two places where there is a vent opening to the
crawl space beneath the house, red brick or brick rubble can be seen beneath the
concrete of the porch floor. Although usually porch floors were constructed of wood,
in this case, where the porch rests immediately on the ground, a wood floor would have
rotted in a short period of time.

The porch can be accessed from its east ends on the north and south sides of the house,
but the primary, front, entrance to the porch is at the northwest corner. Without the
more common placement of a porch entrance directly in front of the house entrance,
the corner entrance to the porch at the McCanless House requires one to cross half of
the façade before arriving at the front door. Nevertheless, a photograph taken several
years after the construction of the house shows a fence gate at the end of a diagonal
walk leading to the corner entrance to the porch. The fence, composed of granite posts
and pipe rails, does not survive.

The porch roof appears to have been in the process of being repaired at some point in
recent years, but the repairs were not completed. The form of the porch roof is original,
and much of the structural framework remains intact, although supplemented by replacement or sister boards. The boards creating the boxed cornice have been removed, as has the porch ceiling. The roof decking consists of replacement plywood and is covered by asbestos shingles.4

Kitchen

Approximately a walkway’s width behind the house, but offset to the north, is a one-story, granite-veneered brick outbuilding believed to have been the kitchen. Sanborn maps show that the space between it and the house was sheltered by the extended house porch. That porch is gone, and a frame porch that appears to have been added in recent years lines the east side and south end of the building, continuing westward to the rear entrance of the house. The porch has plain posts, a plain balustrade, and a shed roof covered with standing-seam metal. The walls of the kitchen building are faced with coursed granite blocks, but these are smaller and less precisely cut than are those on the house. Likewise, the mortar joints, although beaded like those on the house, are much less refined, with mortar spread outward beyond the bead to fill spaces resulting from the uneven stones. The differences between the masonry of the house and the outbuilding suggest that the two structures may have been built at different times.

However, while this may be the case, it seems more likely that they were built at the same time. The kitchen building can be seen clearly in a ca. 1900 photograph of the house, so it certainly had been built by that time. Then, too, the fact that the stones of the house chimneys are much smaller than are those on the walls of the house, suggests that the size and grade of granite used related to its placement. With an outbuilding, the level of refinement used for the house may not have been considered necessary.

The kitchen building has two openings on either side and one at each end. At the north end of the building is a window and at the south end is a door. The east side has a window in the south half and a window converted from a door in the north half. The west side has a door with a three-light transom in the north half. Originally, this door was probably a window. The south half of the west side has a five-horizontal-panel wood door. The one-over-one sash of the windows at the north end and on the south end of the east side may be original. It is not known if either the five-panel door on the west side or the glass-and-wood-paneled door on the south end is original.

The kitchen building has a standing-seam metal side-gable roof with boxed and molded eaves with returns at both ends. The gables are weather boarded, and each has a four-over-four sash window. A granite chimney rises from the center of the roof.

3. Archaeological remains such as trash pits, privies, wells, as well as other structural remains may be present which may present information concerning the land use patterns, social standing and social mobility of the owner and family. It is also possible to find evidence of structural details. No archaeological studies have been done at this

4. Integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials and feeling:

The physical integrity of the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House differs on the exterior from the interior. Judging from a ca. 1900 overall photograph of the house taken several years after its construction, the exterior remains remarkably intact. It retains its original three-story, three-bay-wide and four-bay-deep form with its round corner tower and wraparound porch. It retains its Second Empire styling with its third-story concave mansard roof with gabled dormers. The exterior retains most of its original materials, including its strong, rusticated-granite facing, its granite chimneys, its granite porch, and the decorative slate tiles that sheathe the roof and dormers. The house retains its unusual wraparound porch with tapered granite posts set on granite blocks and robust granite balustrade that is repeated around the flat roof of the tower. The structure of the porch roof remains intact, but the wood ceiling, boxed cornice, and fascia board are missing, and the replacement plywood decking is covered with asphalt shingles. The condition of the porch roof appears to be the result of unfinished repairs in recent years. Physical evidence indicates that the porch once wrapped around the northeast corner of the house to the rear, but that portion of the porch was removed at some unknown date. The fenestration pattern of the house remains the same as it was originally, and the front door and three large façade windows survive intact. Although the other windows have been replaced with vinyl-framed sash, they are the same size and one-over-one sash configuration as the originals. Thus, the fact that these windows are replacements is not immediately apparent. At the rear of the house, the first-story door and the windows directly above it have been replaced with institutional doors, and a fire escape has been added. These changes to the rear wall have little impact on the overall appearance of the house.

The kitchen still stands behind the house. Its form and granite-faced brick walls are original, as are the locations of its fenestration openings, although one window has been converted to a door, and one door has been changed to a window. The porch does not appear to be original. It may have been added when the house was converted to a restaurant. The exterior changes to the kitchen building do not affect the overall appearance of the historic property.

Several young trees in the front yard and the granite-post-and-metal-pipe fence shown in the ca. 1900 photograph do not survive. Despite the changes described above, the most essential features that define the exterior of the house survive in good condition, so that if Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless were riding down South Main Street today, he would have no problem recognizing the house that was his home from its construction in 1897 until his death in 1920.

Based on this discussion of the physical integrity of the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House, the following can be concluded. Except for the deteriorated...
condition of the wraparound porch roof, and several replacement windows, the exterior of the house is in excellent condition. The condition of the interior ranges from poor to good, depending on the location. Considering the seven aspects of integrity: The house remains at its original location on South Main Street in Salisbury. During McCanless’s lifetime, the physical setting of the house included the same flat terrain on which it currently stands is intact. The house stood in the midst of nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century dwellings along both sides of the street. Although today most of those houses have been replaced by small commercial buildings and vacant lots as the commercial center of Salisbury has moved southward. The house retains its physical relationship with South Main Street to the west and the railroad to the east that separates the property from the National Cemetery. Except for the replacement windows and the deteriorated porch roof, the exterior of the house displays a high degree of integrity in terms of its design, materials, and workmanship. Because of the poor treatment the interior the house received in the last quarter century as a result of remodeling efforts, the interior as a whole does not possess strong integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. The interior does retain a large percentage of its most character-defining stylistic features that reflect the sophisticated tastes of the McCanlesses. Due to its Second Empire and Colonial Revival stylistic features and strong use of granite and slate, the house conveys the feeling of the later nineteenth/early twentieth century house in an urban setting with easy access to granite quarries in the area. In retaining, for the most part, its original exterior appearance and to a lesser extent, many original interior features, the house retains a strong association with N.B. McCanless, who built it in 1897 as his family home and resided here until his death in 1920. During those years, he was a mover and a shaker in the development of Salisbury. Deteriorated and missing materials on the porch can be repaired while the introduction of vinyl windows and the installation of modern doors and a fire escape on the back of the house are minimally visible and the windows and doors can be replaced with reproduction features. All of these alterations, even when taken collectively, do not detract significantly from the house’s overall architectural integrity. Overall, despite the integrity issues associated with the interior, The Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House retains sufficient integrity for inclusion in the National Register under criterion B and should be recognized as a local landmark.

5. The property boundaries which are less than one acre (0.378 acres) includes all of the significant buildings and is representative of the properties appearance on 1897.

V. Supporting documentation
   1. Digital Photography (Powerpoint enclosed)
      a. Power Point Slides: 2,3,4,5,6,7
      b. Power Point Slides: 8-17
      c. Included in (a)

   2. Sketch of Floor Plan Power Point Slides: 18-22
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NAPOLEON BONAPARTE MCCANLESS HOUSE
619 S MAIN STREET, SALISBURY NC
SITE PLAN & PROPOSED DESIGNATION MAP

KITCHEN STRUCTURE
Ca. 1897-1900

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE MCCANLESS HOUSE
Ca. 1897

ASSESSED TAX VALUE: $269,360
October 30, 2020

Catherine Garner  
Development Services Specialist  
132 North Main St.  
Salisbury, NC 28145

RE: Proposed Designation of the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House, 619 South Main St., Salisbury, Rowan County

Dear Ms. Garner:

Thank you for the report we received on the proposed designation of Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House, 619 South Main St., Salisbury, Rowan County. We have reviewed the report and offer the following comments in accordance with North Carolina General Statute 160D-946.

According to the report, the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House is of local historical importance as a notable example of Second Empire design executed in granite block and for its association with a local entrepreneur, Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless, who was important in Salisbury’s history.

The Office of State Archaeology concurs with statement in the report that accompanies the Historic Landmark Designation application that there may be significant archaeological remains present, particularly given the age of the property and the association with an individual important in the local history in Salisbury. We also agree with section of the report that states “[a]rchaeological remains such as trash pits, privies, wells, as well as other structural remains may be present which may present information concerning the land use patterns, social standing and social mobility of the owner and family. It is also possible to find evidence of structural details.” We recommend care be taken to avoid inadvertent damage or destruction of any potential resources during any ground disturbing activities. If ground-disturbing activities are planned, we recommend a professional archaeologist first be consulted to help ensure impacts to archaeological resources are avoided or mitigated.

We have shared one recommendation with staff to strengthen the integrity discussion, but the report overall, however, makes a solid case for designation. We believe the report provides the local governing board with sufficient information to determine whether the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House possesses the requisite special local significance and integrity for local historic landmark designation.
Landmark designation means the community recognizes the property is worthy of preservation because of its special significance to the local community. Any substantial changes in design, materials, and appearance to the property would be subject to the design review procedures of the preservation commission.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the report. Please note, our comments are advisory only and therefore, non-binding. Once the governing board has received a recommendation from the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission, it should proceed in the same manner as would otherwise be required for an amendment to the zoning ordinance. Once the decision has been made, please return a completed copy of the enclosed form to our office.

This letter serves as our comments on the proposed designation of the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House. Please contact me at 919-814-6576 should you have any questions about our comments.

Sincerely,

Kristi Brantley
Local Preservation Commissions/CLG Coordinator

CC: Commission Chair

Enclosure
AN ORDINANCE DESIGNATING THE “NAPOLEON BONAPARTE MCCANLESS HOUSE”, LOCATED AT 619 SOUTH MAIN STREET IN SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, AS A HISTORIC LANDMARK

WHEREAS, G.S. § 160D-945 provides for the designation of historic landmarks; and

WHEREAS, the City of Salisbury has created the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission as a commission having the authority to exercise, within the planning jurisdiction of the City, the powers and duties conferred by N.C.G.S. 160D-942; and

WHEREAS, the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House is located at 619 South Main Street in Salisbury, North Carolina, and is identified by Rowan County Tax Parcel ID No. 015 397 (“the Property”); and

WHEREAS, the Property is currently owned by Historic Salisbury Foundation, Inc., who have requested and consented to the landmark designation; and

WHEREAS, the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission (the “Commission”) has complied with the applicable provisions of G.S. § 160D-946, and has issued a Landmark Designation Report on August 20, 2020, a copy of which is on file with the Commission and to which reference is made for more specific information, recommending designation of the Property as a historic landmark; and

WHEREAS, as set forth in the Landmark Designation Report, and in accordance with G.S. § 160D-945, the Commission has determined that the Property is of special significance in terms of its historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance, and possesses integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and/or association; and

WHEREAS, the State Historic Preservation Office (“SHPO”) of the North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources has been provided the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed designation; and

WHEREAS, the SHPO reviewed the proposed designation and issued a letter of comment dated October 30, 2020, in which it concluded that the structure “is of local historical importance as a notable example of Second Empire design executed in granite block and for its association with a local entrepreneur, Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless”; and

WHEREAS, the Commission held a duly-noticed public hearing on December 10, 2020, with respect to this ordinance and designation of the Property as a historic landmark as contemplated herein, and following said hearing voted to recommend that the Salisbury City Council designate the Property as a historic landmark; and

WHEREAS, the Salisbury City Council held a duly-noticed public hearing on January 19, 2021, with respect to this ordinance and designation of the Property as a historic landmark as contemplated herein; and
WHEREAS, the Salisbury City Council, having taken into full consideration all statements and information presented at the public hearings and in the Landmark Designation Report, finds that the Property meets all qualifying elements of a historic landmark, particularly, that it is of special significance in terms of its historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance, and possesses integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and/or association; and

WHEREAS, the Salisbury City Council finds that the Property’s preservation should be encouraged and ensured.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City of Salisbury hereby designates the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House, located at 619 South Main Street in Salisbury, North Carolina, as a Salisbury Historic Landmark pursuant to G.S. § 160D-945. Said Property being more particularly described as follows:

The Property is generally described as the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House, which is a residence on an approximately 0.385-acre lot located at 619 South Main Street, Salisbury, Rowan County, North Carolina, identified as Rowan County Tax Parcel ID No. 015 397, and further described in Deed Book 1329, Page 250 of the Rowan County Registry. Those elements of the Property that are protected by and governed in accordance with this Ordinance are: the complete exterior of the house; and the land area of the Property including the accessory structures as described in Part II of the Landmark Designation Report, which is attached to this Ordinance as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference herein. This property is currently owned by Historic Salisbury Foundation, Inc.

SECTION 2. No portion of the interior or exterior features of any building, site, structure, area, or object that is designated in this Ordinance may be altered, restored, moved, remodeled, or reconstructed so that a change in design, material, or outer appearance occurs unless and until a Certificate of Appropriateness is obtained from the Commission or its successors; provided, however, that the City of Salisbury Planning Director or designee may approve Certificates of Appropriateness for minor works as listed in the Salisbury Historic Design Guidelines. The Commission shall review Certificates of Appropriateness for interior alterations using The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

SECTION 3. No portion of the exterior features of any building, site, structure, or object that is designated in this Ordinance may be demolished unless and until a Certificate of Appropriateness is obtained from the Commission or a period of three hundred and sixty-five (365) days has elapsed following final review by the Commission of a request for demolition (or any longer period of time required by G.S. § 160D-949 as it may be amended hereafter); provided, however, that demolition may be denied by the Commission in the event that the State Historic Preservation Officer determines that the building, site, structure, or object has statewide significance as provided by G.S. § 160D-949.
SECTION 4. Nothing in this Ordinance shall be construed to prevent or delay ordinary maintenance or repair of any architectural feature in or on said landmark that does not involve a change in design, material, or outer appearance thereof, nor to prevent or delay the construction, reconstruction, alteration, restoration, demolition or removal of any such feature when a building inspector or similar official certifies to the Commission that such action is required for the public safety because of an unsafe condition. Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the owner of the historic landmark from making any use of the historic landmark not prohibited by other statutes, ordinances, or regulations. Owners of locally designated historic landmarks are expected to be familiar with and follow The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Salisbury Historic Design Guidelines, the guidelines used by the Commission to evaluate proposed alterations or additions.

SECTION 5. The Commission shall have no jurisdiction over the interior features of the Property, with the exception of those portions of the interior that are included in the landmark designation by this Ordinance.

SECTION 7. City staff is hereby authorized to have posted on the site herein described a suitable sign indicating that said site has been designated a historic landmark by action of the Commission and the Salisbury City Council; provided, however, should the owners of the Property not consent to the posting of said sign on the Property, City staff is hereby authorized to have the sign located on the public right-of-way adjacent to the Property.

SECTION 8. All owners of the Property whose identity and addresses can be ascertained by the exercise of due diligence, shall be sent by certified mail a copy of this Ordinance.

SECTION 9. Copies of this Ordinance shall be filed and indexed in the offices of the City Clerk, Community Planning Services, Rowan County Register of Deeds, the Rowan County Building Inspector, and the Rowan County Tax Administrator, as required by applicable law.

SECTION 10. In the event any building, site, structure, or object designated in this Ordinance is demolished in accordance with the ordinances of the City of Salisbury, this Ordinance may be repealed.

SECTION 11. Any violation of this Ordinance shall be unlawful as by law provided.

SECTION 12. This Ordinance shall be effective on the date of adoption.
I. General Information
   1. Common Name: Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House
   2. Location: 619 South Main Street, Salisbury, NC
   3. Tax parcel ID: 015 397
   4. Owner: Historic Salisbury Foundation
   5. Owner Address: PO BOX 4221, Salisbury, NC 28145
   6. Appraised Tax Value: $269,360.00

II. Abstract
   1. The McCanless House was built in 1897 by Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless, a prodigious Salisbury entrepreneur, who made significant contributions to industry and commerce in Salisbury during the late 1800s and early 1900s. His efforts at promoting the material prosperity of Salisbury and Rowan County helped shape the character of those places. McCanless’s had a leading role in the organization, funding and or building of the following ventures: Vance Cotton Mill, Kesler Cotton Mill, North Side Roller Mill, Doggins/Coggin Mines Company, Yadkin Finishing Company, Harris Granite Company, Salisbury Savings Bank, Peoples National Bank, Morris Plan Company (later Security Bank and Trust Company), the Washington Building, Central Hotel, and the Empire Block and Hotel. The house was recognized in 2014 by the National Register of Historic Places under criterion B as the home of an important local citizen. The Historic Salisbury Foundation is requesting local Historic Landmark designation to add a city level protection for this important historic property. The property is significant to Salisbury history under criteria B and C (architecture). The property is located in an area of Salisbury that is likely to have significant commercial development in the future. It is appropriate for Salisbury and the city’s pride in its historical past to help support the preservation of this significant property.

   2. The main house and the semi-attached kitchen building as well as the 0.378 acres are to be included in the designation. The land included in the request is the legal parcel and it is representative of the land that is historically associated with the home. Because of the age of the property and the use of materials in the 1800s it is possible that there may be some archeological significance to the land.

      Only the exterior of the house is to be included in the local designation. The few remaining character defining features of the Colonial Revival style interior are to be preserved through convents that Historic Salisbury Foundation will establish before the property is sold.

House Interior

Local designation of the house interior is not being requested. The interior has lost most of its integrity due to multiple ownership and attempts to modernize. However, there
The Salisbury City Council is authorized by N.C.G.S. 160A, Part 3C to designate local historic landmarks that are deemed by the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) to be of special significance in terms of their historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance; and that possess integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling and/or association.

**Owners of local historic landmarks are eligible for property tax benefits.**

Owners are eligible to apply annually for a 50% property tax deferral as long as the property’s significant historic or architectural features are maintained. N.C.G.S. 105-278 authorizes this benefit:

§ 105-278. Historic properties.

(a) Real property designated as a historic property by a local ordinance adopted pursuant to former G.S. 160A-399.4 or designated as a historic landmark by a local ordinance adopted pursuant to G.S. 160A-400.5 is designated a special class of property under authority of Article V, Sec. 2(2) of the North Carolina Constitution. Property so classified shall be taxed uniformly as a class in each local taxing unit on the basis of fifty percent (50%) of the true value of the property as determined pursuant to G.S. 105-285 and 105-286, or 105-287.

(b) The difference between the taxes due on the basis of fifty percent (50%) of the true value of the property and the taxes that would have been payable in the absence of the classification provided for in subsection (a) shall be a lien on the property of the taxpayer as provided in G.S. 105-355(a). The taxes shall be carried forward in the records of the taxing unit or units as deferred taxes. The deferred taxes for the preceding three fiscal years are due and payable in accordance with G.S. 105-277.1F when the property loses the benefit of this classification as a result of a disqualifying event. A disqualifying event occurs when there is a change in an ordinance designating a historic property or a change in the property, other than by fire or other natural disaster, that causes the property’s historical significance to be lost or substantially impaired. In addition to the provisions in G.S. 105-277.1F, no deferred taxes are due and all liens arising under this subsection are extinguished when the property’s historical significance is lost or substantially impaired due to fire or other natural disaster. (1977, c. 869, s. 2; 1981, c. 501; 1989, c. 706, s. 3.1; 2005-435, s. 38; 2006-162, s. 28; 2008-35, s. 2.5; 2010-95, s. 17.)

The deferment reduces the taxable value of the property by 50%. This means that any special taxes are also reduced; for example, a landmark property located in a Municipal Service District would see its MSD tax revenue reduced by 50%.

The value of the deferred property taxes are held as a lien against the property. In the event that the property loses landmark status, due to loss or impairment of historical significance or changes in the designating ordinance, the deferred taxes for the previous three years are payable to the owner. If a property loses its historic significance due to a fire or natural disaster, no recapture of past tax deferments will occur.

On the following pages, the tax implications of the designation of example landmarks is provided.
**Example 1: Historic Commercial Building**

- Value: $900,000.00
- Special Taxes:
  - Located in Municipal Service District
- Tax Rates:
  - City Tax Rate: 0.7196%
  - MSD Tax Rate: 0.176%
- Pre-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years
  - Taxable Value: $900,000.00
  - City Revenue: $64,764.00
  - MSD Revenue: $15,840.00
- Post-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years
  - 50% REDUCTION IN TAXABLE VALUE
  - Taxable Value: $450,000.00
  - City Revenue: $32,382.00
  - MSD Revenue: $7,920.00

*The designation of this property would reduce the City’s revenue by $40,302.00 over 10 years.*

**Example 2: Large Historic Residence**

- Value: $1,200,000.00
- Special Taxes: N/A
- Tax Rates:
  - City Tax Rate: 0.7196%
- Pre-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years
  - Taxable Value: $1,200,000.00
  - City Revenue: $86,352.00
- Post-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years
  - 50% REDUCTION IN TAXABLE VALUE
  - Taxable Value: $600,000.00
  - City Revenue: $43,176.00

*The designation of this property would reduce the City’s revenue by $43,176.00 over 10 years.*
Example 3: Modest Historic Residence

- Value: $350,000.00
- Special Taxes: N/A
- Tax Rates:
  - City Tax Rate: 0.7196%
- Pre-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years
  - Taxable Value: $350,000.00
  - City Revenue: $25,186.00
- Post-Landmark Taxes Paid, 10-Years
  - 50% REDUCTION IN TAXABLE VALUE
    - Taxable Value: $175,000.00
    - City Revenue: $12,593.00

The designation of this property would reduce the City's revenue by $12,186.00 over 10 years.

Additional Resources:
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Please Select Submission Category:  □ Public  □ Council  □ Manager  □ Staff

Requested Council Meeting Date:  January 19, 2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request:  Community Planning Services

Name of Presenter(s):  Catherine Garner, Senior Planner

Requested Agenda Item:  Public comment regarding eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places of the Edgar S. and Madge Temple House at 1604 Statesville Blvd, Salisbury, NC

Description of Requested Agenda Item:  The Edgar S. and Madge Temple House at 1604 Statesville Boulevard is being nominated to the National Register of Historic Places. As the local Certified Local Government (CLG), the City is tasked with receiving public comment regarding the property’s eligibility for listing in the National Register. Comments received, and subsequent recommendation to list or not list, are to be sent to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in advance of the National Register Advisory Committee (NRAC) meeting on February 11, 2021. From there, the nomination will proceed to the National Park Service.

The Edgar S. and Madge Temple House was established as a Local Historic Landmark in 2017.

Attachments:  □ Yes  □ No

Fiscal Note:  (If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item:  (Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)

Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Catherine Garner, Senior Planner, 704-638-5212, catherine.garner@salisburync.gov.

□ Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)

☒ Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

Finance Manager Signature  Department Head Signature

______________________________  _____________________________
Hannah Jacobson
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Budget Manager Signature

****All agenda items must be submitted at least 7 days before the requested Council meeting date***

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved  ☐ Delayed  ☐ Declined

Reason:
MEMO

TO: Salisbury City Council  
FROM: Catherine Garner, staff liaison to the Historic Preservation Commission  
DATE: January 5, 2021  
RE: Public Comment on National Register Eligibility – Edgar S. and Madge Temple House, 1604 Statesville Blvd

The Edgar S. and Madge Temple house at 1604 Statesville Blvd, Salisbury, is under consideration for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. As the Certified Local Government, the City is required to hold a public comment period at HPC and City Council regarding the proposed nomination. The Historic Preservation Commission will receive public comment at their meeting on January 14, 2021. Comments received and subsequent recommendation is then sent to the State Historic Preservation Office and the property owners regarding the eligibility of the property to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The nomination will be reviewed at the National Register Advisory Committee’s meeting on February 11, 2021. Pending the NRAC’s decision, the application will proceed to the National Park Service for final review.

A copy of the nomination is attached for Council’s review and consideration. The Temple House was constructed in 1936 in the Spanish Colonial Revival style. The house retains a strong hacienda/ranch form with a central courtyard and extensive gardens. A detached garage and chicken house, both ca. 1936, are included in the nomination. The property is being proposed for listing under Criterion C as a property [that] embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. The Temple House became a Salisbury Local Historic Landmark in 2017.
December 7, 2020

Catherine Garner, Senior Planner
City of Salisbury
P.O. Box 479
Salisbury, NC 28145

RE: Edgar S. and Madge Temple House, 1640 Statesville Boulevard, Salisbury, Rowan County

Dear Ms. Garner:

Enclosed is a copy of the nomination for the Edgar S. and Madge Temple House, which is scheduled for presentation to the North Carolina National Register Advisory Committee on February 11, 2021. For more information about meeting details and updates on how to view the meeting, please visit the Secretary of State’s Public Meeting Calendar at https://sosnc.gov/online_services/calendar/Search and search “National Register Advisory Committee.” We will send you a copy of the standard property owner notification letter within the next several weeks.

As a Certified Local Government, you normally have sixty (60) days in which to comment on the proposed nomination. If you do not respond by February 10, 2021 on the proposed nomination, approval of it will be assumed. Please note that Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission is to provide an opportunity for public comment on this nomination according to the terms specified in the certification agreement the city signed with this office. A copy of your notice to the public should be forwarded to our office along with any comments the Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission, and Mayor Alexander or the Salisbury City Council wish to make on the nomination to satisfy federal and state requirements.

Please use the enclosed comment forms to send us the responses. If you have any questions concerning this nomination, we will be happy to help. Please direct any inquiries to our State Historic Preservation Office’s National Register Coordinator, Jenn Brosz, at jenn.brosz@ncdcr.gov.

Sincerely,

Dr. Kevin Cherry
State Historic Preservation Officer

KC/jhs

Enclosures

cc: Karen Alexander, Mayor, City of Salisbury
    Greg Edds, Chairman, Rowan County Board of Commissioners
The federal and state guidelines for the Certified Local Government Program require that the CLGs participate in the process of nominating properties to the National Register of Historic Places. This participation involves the review of nominations within the jurisdiction of the CLG by the CLG Commission and the chief elected local official. Opportunity for public comment must be provided during the 60-day comment period. The commission and the chief elected official are required to submit comments to the State Historic Preservation Office and the owner of the property relaying their findings as to the eligibility of the property under consideration for listing in the National Register. The attached forms are provided for you to facilitate your review of nominations and your submittal of comments to the State Historic Preservation Office. A copy of the criteria for listing in the National Register is also enclosed for your reference and use.

Although the federal regulations governing the CLG program call for the chief elected local official to provide comments on proposed National Register nominations within the CLG jurisdiction, North Carolina law stipulates that the mayor or chairman of the board of county commissioners may act only in an administrative capacity on behalf of the local governing board. If a certified local government has doubts about the legality of the chief elected official assuming sole responsibility for comments on proposed National Register nominations, it may wish to consider two alternatives: 1) having the governing board review the nominations or 2) having the governing board pass a resolution granting the chief elected local official the authority to furnish comments on behalf of the governing board.
In order to fulfill the required comment procedures, please complete the information below and the appropriate comment paragraph that is attached after you have reviewed the nomination. This information should be returned to Jenn Brosz, National Register Coordinator; Survey and National Register Branch, North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office; 4617 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-4617.

COMMENTS ARE DUE IN THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE BY: **February 10, 2021**

1. Name of Certified Local Government: **City of Salisbury**

2. Name of CLG Commission: **Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission**

3. Property being reviewed for nomination: **Edgar S. and Madge Temple House**

4. Please attach documentation of the measures taken to provide for public comment during the nomination review and a record of any comments received, as per your certification agreement with the State Historic Preservation Office.

5. In approving local governments for certification, the SHPO may have stipulated that the Commission obtain the services of professional historians, architectural historians, or archaeologists when reviewing National Register nominations, if those disciplines are not represented in the Commission membership. If this stipulation applies to you, please note the name of the professional you consulted below and his/her appropriate field. If you have any questions about the applicability of this stipulation to your commission, contact Kristi Brantley, Certified Local Government Coordinator, State Historic Preservation Office at 919.814.6576.
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions.

1. Name of Property
   Historic name: Temple, Edgar S. and Madge, House
   Other names/site number: N/A
   Name of related multiple property listing: N/A
   (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

2. Location
   Street & number: 1604 Statesville Boulevard
   City or town: Salisbury
   State: NC
   County: Rowan
   Not For Publication: N/A
   Vicinity: N/A

3. State/Federal Agency Certification
   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
   I hereby certify that this __X__ nomination ___ request for determination of eligibility meets
   the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic
   Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.
   In my opinion, the property __X__ meets ___ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I
   recommend that this property be considered significant at the following
   level(s) of significance:
   __ national      __ statewide      __X__ local
   Applicable National Register Criteria:
   ___A   ___B   __X__ C   ___D

   __________________________________________
   Signature of certifying official/Title:  Date
   North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources
   State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

   In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria.

   __________________________________________
   Signature of commenting official:  Date
   Title:  State or Federal agency/bureau
   or Tribal Government
4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

___ entered in the National Register

___ determined eligible for the National Register

___ determined not eligible for the National Register

___ removed from the National Register

___ other (explain:)

______________________________

Signature of the Keeper

______________________________

Date of Action

5. Classification

Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

Private:  

___ Public – Local

___ Public – State

___ Public – Federal

Category of Property

(Check only one box.)

___ Building(s)

___ District

___ Site

___ Structure

___ Object
Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register: N/A

6. Function or Use
Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

DOMESTIC / single dwelling

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

DOMESTIC / single dwelling
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Spanish Colonial Revival

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property:
Foundation: Brick, Concrete
Roof: Terra Cotta/ Mission barrel clay tile
Walls: Stucco

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph

The Spanish Colonial Revival style house built by Edgar Samuel Temple in 1936, is located in Salisbury, NC in the Milford Hills residential section of Statesville Boulevard at the northwest corner of North Milford Drive. The road and house are at a slight angle, but for the purposes of this nomination, the front façade faces south. The lot has a ca.1936 freestanding rectangular two-story garage north of the house, situated at the northeast side of a half circle driveway off Milford Drive. There is also a ca.1936 small structural clay tile outbuilding behind (northwest of) the garage that was built by Mr. Temple and historically used as a chicken house. The property is in excellent condition and has had no structural alterations to the exterior or interior since its construction and has maintained its historical integrity. The house is set back 100 feet from Statesville Boulevard on the east side of the 1.23-acre lot with large open grassy areas and well landscaped raised beds with numerous mature trees. The west and north areas of the lot are open grassy areas with mature trees and well-placed planting areas. A sidewalk separates the house and property from the street right-of-way.

The Temple House is unique to the neighborhood for its architectural style and the 200-foot street frontage. Surrounding dwellings are centered closer to the road on 100-foot lots. The Milford Hills Development has had several periods of construction. The home closest to the
Temple House, which is on the adjacent corner of North Milford drive, is a c.1925 two-story, hipped roof, brick house. Behind the Temple House as you travel north on North Milford Drive there are ranch style houses that were built between 1960 and 2000. The Statesville Boulevard streetscape is mostly ranch style houses that were built between 1950 and 1960.

The 2,500 square foot Temple House has a strong hacienda/rancho form. The plan is roughly H-shaped. The front façade faces south. Two gabled sections/wings (roof ridges running north-south) are parallel to each other as the east and west wings of the house. The east gabled section has a centered shallow cross gable. The main gabled sections are connected near their south ends by a perpendicular segment (roof ridge running east-west). A one and one half-story square “bell tower” with a pyramidal roof is located off center on the south elevation. Its prominent presence on the front façade lends to the style’s asymmetrical nature. The house is constructed of structural clay tile and brick covered with stucco. The exterior walls are smooth stucco over structural terra cotta/clay load-bearing wall tile. The house has a low-pitched single barrel 14” red terra cotta/clay tile roof with very slight eave overhang.1 The roof is supported by steel and wood beam rafters. Large multi-pane double-hung recessed wood windows are found on multiple elevations. Windowsills and lintels are wood. A large, stucco-covered, brick tower chimney with tile accent is centrally located on the north wall of the house, facing the courtyard. A central rear courtyard on the north elevation is surrounded on the east, north, and west by the intersecting sections of the house plan. Paired and single multi-pane wood French doors, sheltered by bracketed, tile-clad shed awnings, lead from the house interior to the raised courtyard. This courtyard area is incorporated into the house foundation and is one-step up from a second courtyard that has been created in the rear lawn.

The foundation is crawlspace, primarily perimeter and pier with 10’ x 2” wooden beams. There is a small concrete basement on the rear northeast elevation and a poured concrete foundation under the interior courtyard. The rear (north-facing) center courtyard flooring is a combination of solid and broken quarry tile that surrounds four grass squares that are each eight feet square.

The well-designed landscaping reflects the philosophy of George Washington Smith who is considered many to be the “father of Spanish Colonial Revival Architecture.” Through the strategic placement of windows and doors as well as plantings, “the outside of the house and the inside of the house should flow seamlessly through the use of light and shadow.”2 This philosophy is well defined at the Temple House by the mature foundation plantings (yuccas, Camellias, English boxwoods and azaleas) and the many mature trees (pines, evergreens, holly trees and exceptionally large crépe myrtles) that enhance and separate the gardens area of the grounds.

---

Narrative Description

---

South Elevation (Front Façade)
The front (south) façade has six bays. Matching banks of three windows are centered under each gable at the outer ends of the façade. These windows consist of a centered six-over-six double hung window that is 34” x 62.” On either side of this window there are smaller 19” x 62” double hung windows that are four-over-four. On both gable eaves there are small, wooden louvered arch shaped roof vents. The front entrance is through the symbolic “bell tower” that is one- and one-half stories tall and is off center, approximately one fourth the distance from the east corner. The bell tower has a pyramid roof with two bands of decorative quarry tile just below the roof line. There are three steps that lead to the small entry stoop. The steps are covered in solid quarry tile. The front stoop is outlined in solid quarry tile with broken tile in the center. A distinct feature of the entrance is the oak single leaf, ten panel 6’10”x 3’ front door with a large Spanish hammered brass handle. The door has a formed concrete surround that features low relief pilasters with a scrolled pediment lintel split by a flat keystone. West of the front entrance, the front façade is recessed. This area has three distinctive arched six-over-six windows. The top section of the windows has glass panes that have been cut to accommodate the arch shape.

West Elevation
The west elevation has four bays. Moving south to north there are three sets of evenly spaced window banks that have the same dimensions and configuration as the ones described on the front façade. Additionally, there is a shallow rectangular bay with tile roof located between the center and south windows. Centered here is a small double hung six-over-six window. This window services the west wing bathroom.

North Elevations (and Interior Courtyard Elevations)
The rear interior courtyard (part of the contributing site), which is one of the most distinct features of the house, is set within three sides of the house creating the “H” shape. It is flanked by the east and west gabled wings with the rear of the courtyard forming the north wall of the living room area. Under the west rear gable there is a three-window bank. The gable has a small arched roof vent. The east rear gable has two large double hung windows set on either side of a small exterior stucco chimney. In keeping with the hacienda form, each of the wings has two wooden and glass French doors. On the west wing the doors each open into bedroom areas. On the east wing the first door opens into a bedroom and the second door (closest to the back center of the courtyard) opens to a hallway that services the east wing of the house. On the back center of the courtyard there is a 4-foot-wide stucco clad chimney that extends 12 inches into the courtyard. The chimney has two shoulders that are topped with red solid quarry tile. The shoulder on the west side stops at 8 feet. The shoulder on the east side is at 3 feet. The shoulders dramatically enhance the chimney providing the appearance of a large chimney tower that appears to be 8 feet wide. There is a decorative s-shaped iron anchor plate that is original with the house about midway of the chimney height. On either side of the chimney are double wooden and glass French doors that open into the large living room that encompasses the center section, or hyphen, of the house plan. All of the courtyard doors are elevated and defined by a step that has solid quarry tile on the riser as well as the step. Each door has a bracketed awning that is constructed of wood and covered with the same mission barrel clay tile that is used on the roof.

East Elevation
The east elevation has a three-window bank (same as described above), at the north end followed by a small wooden six over six window that services the bathroom. The center of the elevation has a small gabled extension that has two paired wooden six-over-six windows that provide a beautiful view from the kitchen. The south end of the elevation has a three-window bank that matches the window on the north end of the elevation. The east elevation has an outside stairway that goes underground and provides an outside entrance to the basement. This stairway is slightly north of the center of the elevation.

**Interior**

Like the exterior of the house, the interior also maintains its historical integrity. The configuration of the rooms has not been altered and the materials are original. Routine maintenance when needed, has been done using original materials. The interior walls are semi-rough textured stucco. With the exceptions of the bathrooms and kitchen, all rooms have basic 2 7/8-inch crown moldings and 5 1/2 inch colonial style baseboards. The two and a quarter inch tongue and groove red tiger oak flooring is original. The bathrooms have their original mosaic tile floors. The window moldings and door facings are simple 4 1/4 inch unpainted stained wood facings in keeping with the Spanish Colonial Revival style. The only exceptions to this are the moldings in the kitchen, breakfast rooms and the bathrooms. Those moldings were painted white before the current occupants purchased the house. Most likely, these moldings were painted by Mr. Temple sometime after the house was built.

The interior doors are either eight-panel solid wooden doors or 15-pane glass French doors. The two exterior double French doors that go from the courtyard into the living room are 10-pane. All doors have their original decorative brass hardware with skeleton key locks. With the exception of the interior side of the breakfast room door, and interior sides of the bathroom doors, all doors are natural unpainted wood in keeping with the Spanish Colonial Revival style. The ceilings are ten feet. With the exception of the kitchen, the east hall and the entry room, all of the ceiling lighting fixtures are original.

The interior layout of the house is consistent with the form of a hacienda house. The hacienda architectural form refers to buildings and homes with simple stucco exteriors, courtyards and multiple outside entrances. ³

The east wing has a narrow hall that leads to the east wing rooms. At the north end of the east wing hall is a solid wooden door that leads to a bedroom and bath. This room has a French door to the courtyard on the west wall. There is a three-window bank on the east wall and two six-over-six windows on the north wall that are separated by a small external chimney. The ceiling fixture is the original two-light metal fixture. The east wing bathroom is entered from this bedroom. The bathroom has its original tub and original light fixture. The original mosaic tile floor has been preserved, but it was covered with modern solid ceramic tile in 2002. There is a small closet on the east wall of the hallway just outside the bedroom door. Going south down the hall there is a second French door to the courtyard on the west wall and a single French door that leads to the living room. On the east side of the hallway there is a solid wooden door that is the entrance to the breakfast room, the kitchen and the dining room. The south end of the hallway

has a small closet that was originally used as a pantry. The door to the east wing public rooms opens into the breakfast room. To the north, an archway separates the breakfast room from the kitchen and a solid eight-paneled wooden butler’s door separates the breakfast room from the dining room on the south side. The many windows on the east elevation keep this section of the house bright and airy. The original wooden kitchen and breakfast room floors were covered with terra cotta colored ceramic tile in 1993.

The kitchen has hanging cabinets on either side of six-over-six paired windows that are above the sink area. These cabinets have their original wooden and glass mullioned cabinet doors. The counter tops were raised in 1993, but the original solid wood single panel cabinet doors below the countertops were saved and reused. The kitchen has a door that leads to the basement.

A distinctive feature of the breakfast room is a large built-in wooden hutch with a combination of wooden and six-pane glass and mullioned cabinet doors at the top and solid wooden cabinet doors and drawers at the bottom. The two sets of cabinets are separated by a wooden countertop that was covered with Spanish style decorative ceramic tile in 1993.

The dining room can be entered through the butler’s door from the breakfast room or through double glass and wooden French doors on the west wall that lead to the living room. The dining room has a three-window bank on the east wall and a matching window bank on the south wall of the room. The ceiling fixture is the original five-light metal Spanish chandelier.

The living room, which is 30’ x 17’, is distinctive for the use of interior French doors that allow visibility into the east and west wings of the house. The room can be entered through a single French door from the east hallway, through the main entrance, through the two sets of double French doors from the courtyard or through the double French doors on the east side of the room that lead to the dining room. The living room also has a single French door on the west side of the room that leads to a small hall that services the three bedrooms and bathroom of the west wing. There is a single French door on the south side of the room that separates the living room from the small entry room. The living room has a total of six French doors. The south wall beyond the door to the entry room has three distinct arched six-over-six double hung windows. The upper window glass has been cut to accommodate the arch shape. These windows, in combination with the interior French doors and the double French doors on either side of the tower chimney, that lead to the interior courtyard, enhance the concept of the interior going out and the exterior gardens coming in. An additional distinct feature of the living room is the fireplace of the tower chimney centered on the north wall. The chimney extends 11 inches into the room and is 7 feet wide. The fireplace opening is 40” x 33” and is faced with original ochre colored 4-inch square quarry tile. A third row of Spanish style decorative tile was added to the opening in 2019. The hearth is raised and covered with the original ochre tile. The mantle is a 4” x 6” x 77” stained finished robust wooden beam that is supported by five wooden decorative corbels. Above the mantle there are two original metal decorative Spanish sconce light fixtures. Originally, the chimney was totally covered with interior stucco to match the walls. In 2020, the deteriorating stucco above the mantel was removed and the brick was left exposed. The area below the mantle is stucco. The ceiling fixture is the original Spanish five-light metal chandelier.
The west wing room configuration is unusual. Access to the wing is through a French door in the living room. There is a small hall area with a linen closet and an entrance to the west wing bathroom. The bedroom on the south side of this hall is through a solid eight-panel wooden door. This room mirrors the dining room with a bank of three windows on the south wall gable area and another bank of three windows on the west elevation. The room also has a doorway to the bathroom on the north wall. The original ceiling fixture is a simple metal fixture with two lights.

Entry to the second bedroom on the north side of the hall is through an eight-panel solid door. The room has one bank of three windows on the west elevation and an entrance to the bathroom on the south wall. There is a French door to the courtyard on the east wall. There is a small closet on the north wall and a doorway to the third bedroom. The simple original metal light fixture is a duplicate of the fixtures in other bedrooms.

The third bedroom is entered from the second bedroom through a solid wooden eight panel door. It has the same window configuration as the south bedroom with a three-window bank on the west wall and a three-window bank on the north rear gable side. This room also has a small closet on the south wall and a French door exit to the interior courtyard on the east wall. The original ceiling fixture in this room matches those in the other bedrooms.

Because of this unusual configuration, the west bathroom has three doors. The bathroom has its original sink and tub and one original light fixture. The original mosaic tile floor is in excellent condition. The room also has a small six-over-six window above the tub.

Courtyards & Gardens, ca. 1936

The Temple House is a unique example of the Spanish Colonial Revival style in Salisbury that features complementary courtyards and landscaping. According to family interviews, these features were created when the house construction was completed, ca.1936. As a professional landscaper, Mr. Temple saw this area as a necessary element of the Spanish Colonial Revival style of the house. Therefore, the grounds within the National Register boundary are included as a contributing site, and important features of the contributing site are expanded upon in the following paragraphs.

The north “interior” courtyard is at the back of the house, surrounded by the west wing, east, wing, and connecting hyphen. This courtyard is raised 12 inches above ground-level and has three sets of steps for entrance. The courtyard floor has a concrete foundation that is a part of the house foundation. The floor has solid quarry tile that outlines the perimeter and solid quarry tile that outlines each of the eight-foot square grassy areas that are symmetrically placed. The placement of the squares creates a cross pattern of walkways that are outlined in solid quarry tile. The remaining floor is covered in broken quarry tile.

Beyond the “interior” courtyard, the exterior courtyard, though not technically a part of the house, is a reflection and extension of the interior courtyard. This courtyard, which is slightly larger than the interior courtyard, is defined by walkways created with Augusta clay/brick paving.
tiles that were reclaimed from road improvements. These walkways create grassy areas like the ones in the interior courtyard. Two of the areas are square and two are quarter circles. The effect is a half-circle design with walkways that surround the half-circle and walkways that create a cross pattern across the half circle. This half-circle is reflected in the half circle driveway that is on the east side of the house and visible from the exterior courtyard.

A distinctive feature of the exterior garden courtyard design is an original stucco-covered brick wall that is finished with tall archways at each end and placed just north of the rear of the half circle. The middle of the wall is enhanced with an original 9’ x 9’x 9’ triangular fishpond. The center of the stucco wall has an original small lighted alcove that is centered behind the triangular pond, designed for fountain/statuary. When the current owners purchased the Temple House, they found the original concrete fountain statue greatly deteriorated, toppled into the unmaintained original pond. From its remnants, the current owners believe it may have been a “Greek style sculpture of a child.” The current fountain was installed in 1993 as a sympathetic replacement to the original, fitting well within the original alcove. This garden courtyard area, with its standing arches and decorative walkways, is an important feature of the Spanish Colonial Revival style. It creates an outstanding example of the continual flow of the outside coming in and the inside going out.

The western portion of the property, which was originally referenced as lot 250, was landscaped by Mr. Temple as a series of gardens. Each garden area is defined by raised beds that allows visibility from one garden to the next while simultaneously providing a sense of privacy for each garden. Beginning at the south end of the property at the edge of Statesville Blvd. there is a raised bed that separates lots 250 and 251. This bed has pine trees, azaleas and crape myrtles. West of this bed there are unusually large crepe myrtles that are approximately 30 to 40 feet tall. Crepe myrtles were signature trees in most of Mr. Temple’s landscaping projects. Running along the western side of the lot to the halfway point, is a six-foot-wide planting area that defines the property boundary. This area has mature trees and large Ligustrum bushes that create a blind between the Temple property and the neighbor’s land. On the east side of this area there is a raised bed that separates this area from the front lawn of the house. This bed has a gnarled crepe myrtle that demonstrates Mr. Temple’s ability to manipulate the growth of plants. This bed also has a large holly tree, a large pink dogwood, boxwoods and azaleas. The beds create a large open grassy lawn for the west side of the property.

Moving north along the centerline of the property at approximately the mid-point are two raised beds. The east bed contains a sixty-foot pen oak with a canopy that shades the entire bed and shades the west elevation of the house. The west bed has a large hemlock tree. These beds along with another bed on the west side create a small private garden. An additional bed is situated on the east side of this area to separate this garden area from the exterior courtyard. This bed features an ornamental magnolia and boxwoods that allow visibility into the exterior courtyard. This garden has a stone outdoor oven in the north east corner that was built by Mr. Temple. It was damaged by a falling tree in 2010. This garden also has an octagon shaped flagstone pad that was built as the foundation for a large iron gazebo that was painted white. Mr. Temple had been the landscaper for the old National Cemetery in Salisbury. The gazebo was one of the first structures placed in the cemetery after its dedication which was shortly after the end of the Civil War. There are several pictures available of the gazebo that show its placement in the cemetery.
over the mass graves of Union soldiers who died at the Salisbury Prison. On November 25, 1985, the Salisbury Post published a picture of New York Union veterans who survived their time in the prison standing in the gazebo for their 1914 reunion photograph. When the cemetery management decided in the 1940s that the gazebo was beyond repair, Mr. Temple purchased the gazebo. He restored it to its original appearance and placed it on the flagstone pad in his west side garden. Mrs. Temple directed the family to give the gazebo to the city after her death. Mr. and Mrs. Temple had agreed that the gazebo should be given to the city to insure its preservation. The gazebo was moved to the Bell Tower Park in 1994 and is to be included as a featured part of the Bell Tower Green which is a new downtown park that is projected to open in 2021.

West and north of this garden is a bed with holly trees and boxwoods that creates a pathway to the north area of lot 250 which is primarily an open grassy area surrounded by trees. A drainage ditch built by Mr. Temple that is grass-covered, separates the side garden from the north rear area. This ditch runs the full width of the property from the west boundary to North Milford Drive. On the south side of the drainage ditch there are large shrubs that add privacy to the west garden. Additionally, there is an 80-foot Oriental evergreen which is in line with the Chicken House. All of the raised beds were created by Mr. Temple and all of the trees and shrubs that have been described were planted by him as well.

The landscaping on lot 250 blends well with the landscaping on lot 251 where the house is located. In addition to the English boxwoods that are planted on the south and east side of the house, are grafted camelia shrubs/trees that were created by Mr. Temple. These camelias which are planted on either side of the front entrance and in front of the arched windows and the dining room windows on the south elevation have white, dark pink and pink and white candy stripe blossoms all on the same shrub/tree. The blossoms which begin in November and continue to bloom through February can be seen from the living room and the dining room windows. This is another example of Mr. Temple's landscaping that brings the outside inside. On the southeast corner of the lot (intersection of Statesville Blvd and North Milford) there is a raised bed with a large gnarled crepe myrtle that Mr. Temple trained in an oriental fashion to resemble a wind-swept tree. This bed also has a pine tree, a grafted camelia shrub/tree and azaleas. Moving north along the North Milford Drive edge of the property, there are three more large holly trees. The first is a single planting; the second and third are in a raised bed. All of the beds along North Milford Drive have a combination of periwinkle and English ivy as ground cover. There are raised beds on either side of the half-circle driveway that contain shrubs, boxwoods, day lilies and flowering bulbs. On the north side of the garage opening there is a large walnut tree and a Bradford pear tree. A grape arbor which is located on the east side of the chicken house near the entrance to the garage deck was built by the Bowyers in 1995. Originally, a small tree that had grown wild was located in this area. The tree had several Concord grapevines growing through it. Most likely, Mr. Temple had grapes planted in this area. The arbor was built, and the original grapes continue to thrive.

In 1993, when the property was purchased, the Bowyers hired a landscaping company to prune the trees and help clean the raised beds. The arborist stated that many of the plantings were very unusual for the local area. He specifically mentioned the type of hemlock tree, the oriental evergreen tree and also stated that there were five different types on holly trees in the yard. The size of the crepe myrtles as well as the unusual shapes of several of these trees was also noted.
Through his landscape design and his choice of plantings, Mr. Temple completed the 1940s California-inspired concept and interpretation of the Spanish Colonial Revival style home which featured an outside environment that was equally as important as the inside environment.

Garage, ca. 1936

A two-story, front-gabled, stucco-clad, rectangular garage, built ca.1936, is located north of the Temple House. The roof is clad in asphalt shingles and features exposed rafter ends. It is situated on the northwest side of the circular drive off North Milford Drive. The front faces east towards North Milford Drive. The front (east) elevation has a two-car garage opening on the first floor with a paired one-over-one window centered above. The garage opening is covered by more recent wood lattice. The south elevation has a pedestrian door at the west end of the elevation, just north of the courtyard wall and archway. The north elevation has two six over six double hung mullioned windows at each end of the elevation. The north elevation originally had a small cinderblock shed attached to the elevation that was open at both ends with a slanted tin roof. This shed had separated from the building and was beyond repair. It was removed in 2015, and a small patio was created in the area. The west elevation originally had a large opening with sliding wood doors on the first level. The doors were gone when the house was purchased in 1993. In 2013, the opening was closed with cinderblock and a small six-over-six window was added. The cinderblock was covered with stucco to match the rest of the building. The original small stairway to the second floor of the garage, ran from the south end of the elevation to a small porch centered on the west elevation. The staircase access was through the courtyard arch that is attached to the garage on the south elevation. This second-floor porch had a door to the second floor of the garage. The garage second-floor interior has two rooms. This area was used as Mr. Temple’s office and studio space. There is no plumbing in this space. In 2013, the deteriorated stairs and porch were removed, and an elevated second-floor wooden deck was built to replace the small porch. The new deck is the width of the elevation and 10 feet wide. The original door was repaired and retained. The steps to the new deck are centered on the elevation and lead directly to the original door.

Chicken House, ca.1936

A small ca.1936 clay tile chicken house is also located north of the Temple House and west of the garage. It has a tin shed roof with exposed rafter ends. The building is 10 feet square. Early openings appear intact but are clad with more recent wood lattice. Entrance to the building is on the east elevation. The south elevation has a small window opening. The building is constructed of load-baring structural clay tiles. The tiles are exposed and have never been covered or painted. The interior has a concrete floor and elevated areas for chickens to roost. The interior is currently used as a tool shed. Originally wisteria was planted on the west elevation along with flowering bulbs. The garden area on the west elevation has been extended to surround the building in recent years. The plantings include roses, day lilies and seasonable flowers.

Integrity Statement
The historic integrity of the Edgar S. and Madge Temple House on the exterior and the interior is remarkably intact. No structural changes or additions have been made to the exterior or the interior of the house. The property is in its original location and setting on a large corner lot with surrounding residential properties. The integrity of the setting is enhanced by the landscape design that has not been altered. The landscaping has six large oval shaped raised beds that are strategically placed to separate the gardens and guide a person from one garden to the next. Over time, plants have died, but they have been replaced with similar plants to keep the raised beds intact. The north exterior courtyard design has not been altered. The historic integrity of the exterior of the house and the landscaping is excellent. The exterior stucco is approximately 85 percent original. Stucco maintenance repairs have been done using original style materials and workmanship. The wooden windows have not been removed, replaced or changed. Repairs, where needed, did not alter the original configuration. Small, deteriorated sections of the historic windows were repaired, and the original window section was retained. If a window section had to be replaced due to unrepairable deterioration, replacements were custom made to duplicate the original. The house is painted white, which was the original color and the historically accurate color for the style. The recessed windows are painted dark green. It is historically accurate to paint only the actual window with a dark contrasting color.

The Mission, terra cotta barrel tile roof was restored in 2020. The original tiles were removed, cleaned and saved. The old vertical battens were removed. The wooden roof decking was repaired and covered with a rolled ice and water shield before new wooden 2’x 4’’ battens were installed, and the original tiles were put back in place. The old valley tin and chimney crickets were replaced with copper sheeting forms that were created on site to match the original roof construction. All roof work was done with copper nails just as with the original roof. Approximately, five percent of the original tiles were broken in the process. They were replaced with reclaimed tiles that matched in style and color.

The integrity of the interior of the house has been maintained through the use of original style materials and precise workmanship. The interior stucco walls have been repaired as needed with stucco that has been applied by hand using the same method as the original application. The interior retains its significant and character-defining stylistic features that reflect the Spanish Colonial Revival style.

The house displays a high degree of integrity in terms of its design, materials and workmanship. It is an excellent example of the Spanish Colonial Revival style homes that were popular from the late 1920s through early 1940s in the Southwest, Florida and California, but is unusual for Piedmont North Carolina. It reflects the association of the original Milford Hills Residential Park which was the first Salisbury suburban development of small estates, and the work of Edgar Temple who was one of Salisbury’s first residential and commercial landscape architects.

Statement of Archaeological Potential (TBD)
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

☐ A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

☐ B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

☒
C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

☐ D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

☐ A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes
☐ B. Removed from its original location
☐ C. A birthplace or grave
☐ D. A cemetery
☐ E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure
☐ F. A commemorative property
☐ G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

ARCHITECTURE


Period of Significance
1936
**Significant Dates**
1936

**Significant Person**
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)
N/A

**Cultural Affiliation**
N/A

**Architect/Builder**
Temple, Edgar S. (builder/landscaper)

---

**Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph** (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

The Edgar S. and Madge Temple House meets National Register Criterion C, significant at the local level in the area of architecture, as an excellent example of a one-story Spanish Colonial Revival style house and courtyard in Salisbury. Built in 1936 by Edgar S. Temple, a landscape professional, the home was one of the earliest and most prominent homes in the Milford Hills subdivision, which first opened for residential development in the late 1920s. The Temple House retains a high level of historic integrity with nearly all of its character-defining features intact and no changes to the house’s historic plan. The period of significance is 1936, the construction date of the house. Two outbuildings, a multi-level garage and a chicken house, also date to the house’s construction period, and are contributing buildings. The grounds, with
garden plantings, courtyards, stucco-clad wall with archways, statuary niche, and triangular fishpond, are a contributing site. Mr. Temple also completed this landscape work at the time of house construction, and it lends to the design concept of continuous flow between the exterior landscape and interior residential living space of the home.

**Narrative Statement of Significance** (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

**Criterion C – Architecture Context**

Edgar S. Temple built the Temple House at 1604 Statesville Boulevard in Salisbury in 1936, during the second phase of the Eclectic movement in American architecture. Inspired by Western architectural traditions such as Ancient Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Classical designs, a preference for eclectic house styles dominated the United States between WWI and WWII. The renewed popularity for traditional styles, with focus on “architectural correctness,” coincided with the return of American soldiers from Europe after WWII. More affordable photo reproduction of European dwellings and new building technology enabling masonry veneers to affordably mimic traditional European brick and stonework, contributed to the popularity of eclectic architecture. Mediterranean and Spanish period houses included those of Italian Renaissance, Mission, Spanish [Colonial] Revival, Monterey, and Pueblo Revival styles. Patterning one’s house after Old World dwellings fell from favor after WWII, as architectural modernism supplanted the eclectic movement in the United States.⁴

Spanish Colonial Revival style (a.k.a. Spanish Revival style) decorative details stem from “the entire history of Spanish architecture. These may be of Moorish, Byzantine, Gothic, or Renaissance inspiration.”⁵ Limited to the precedent of simple Spanish missions before 1920, Spanish Revival design expanded after the influential 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego. According to architectural historian Virginia McAlester, the widely publicized expo, designed by Bertram Goodhue, emphasized the richness of Spanish Colonial precedents seen in the major buildings of other countries. World War I (1914-1918) caused architects wishing to study and sketch in Europe to concentrate on Spain. There they found a centuries-long and very rich sequence of architecture traditions that they could meld into the quite varied Spanish Colonial Revival.⁶ Architects studied building composition and massing found in Spain in addition to decorative detail. For high-style Spanish Revival designs, some architects sourced rural Andalusian building traditions, where homes informally grew and expanded over time. As explained by Virginia McAlester, “facades generally had little decorative detail and instead emphasized their varied massing.”⁷

Spanish Colonial Revival (a.k.a. Spanish Revival) is most common in the southwestern United States and in Florida, particularly where “original Spanish Colonial buildings occurred and

---

⁵ Ibid., 522.
⁶ Ibid., 522.
⁷ Ibid., 534.
continued into the nineteenth century."\textsuperscript{8} Scattered vernacular examples are found "in suburban developments throughout the country," while landmark examples are uncommon outside of Florida or the southwest.\textsuperscript{9} Architect George Washington Smith (1876-1930), working in southern California, designed high-style Spanish Revival homes, emphasizing varied massing. To promote tourism, industrialist and developer Henry Flagler introduced Spanish Revival in Florida where it acquired its own local interpretation particularly through architects Addison Mizner (1872-1933) and Maurice Fatio (1897-1943). Like the broader eclectic movement, Spanish Revival peaked "on both coasts during the 1920s and early 1930s and passed rapidly from favor during the 1940s."\textsuperscript{10}

The Edgar S. Temple House is an excellent local example of a one-story Spanish Colonial Revival style house with courtyards in Salisbury. It is in keeping with the later 1920s and 1930s evolution of the Spanish Colonial Revival style that first came to prominence in California during the late 1920s. This more relaxed style of residential construction is the precursor of the modern ranch style house. The Spanish Colonial Revival residential style moved from a formal two-story structure to a one-story structure with a more open concept interior and added exterior areas like a courtyard to include outdoor areas into the living space. This new less formal style incorporated the concept of "flow through rooms that transition one area to the next...each room bridged by some form of connecting space, offering transition."\textsuperscript{11} Max Jacobson described this element as follows: "The root of the pattern lies in the combination of ecological, psychological and aesthetic factors...outside rooms can be thought of as habitats...courtyards function as flow through rooms."\textsuperscript{12} As the style evolved it continued to retain the distinctive elements of the early Spanish Colonial Revival style that were developed by architects such as George Washington Smith, Bertram Goodhue, Jeanette Rice and Mary Jane Coulter.

The interior layout of the house is consistent with the form of a hacienda house or western ranch house. The original haciendas were large estates owned by Spanish nobles in Mexico during the sixteenth century. In modern times, the hacienda architectural form/style refers to buildings and homes with simple stucco exteriors, courtyards and multiple outside entrances.\textsuperscript{13} This type of design was made popular in the 1930s by Clifford May. "A descendant of an early California Spanish family, he was raised on a San Diego ranch. Considered by many to be the father of the California ranch-style house, May is noted for combining the western ranch house and Hispanic hacienda styles with elements of modernism. His approach called for houses to be built out instead of up, with the continual goal of bringing the outdoors in. It is not uncommon [...] to find that every room in the house has a connection to the outdoors." In the 1930s, May wrote, "The early Californians had the right idea. They built for the seclusion and comfort of their families, for the enjoyment of relaxation in their homes."\textsuperscript{14} The Temple House reflects these 1930s architectural values, featuring a central courtyard and seven entrances, as well as a more relaxed approach to the Spanish Colonial Revival style. It also provides a user-friendly environment with an interior that provides privacy for the occupants.

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., 522.
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., 534.
\textsuperscript{11} McAlister, A Field Guide to American Houses, 1985, 418-429
\textsuperscript{12} Jacobson, Patterns of Home: Ten essential of Enduring Design, 52
\textsuperscript{13} Tim Street-Porter, Hacienda Architecture of Mexico (New York: Stewart, Tabori & Chang, 1989)
\textsuperscript{14} www.cliffmay.com, Cliff May Architecture. Accessed 11/15/2020
Nationally, Spanish Colonial Revival homes are most commonly cross gabled, while approximately one quarter have side-gabled roofs. Less common, some feature a hipped or flat roof. Some landmark Spanish Colonial Revival residences have rambling compound plans with hipped and gabled roofs combined to mimic roof patterns found in Spanish villages. Character-defining features of the style include asymmetry; low-pitched roofs with minimal eave overhang clad in red tiles; stucco wall finishes (smooth, rough, or tooled); lack of eave or trim between lower walls and upper gable; brick or tile vents in gable ends; round or square towers; and chimneys featuring tilework. Prominent arches are often located at principal windows or on porches. A large focal window is a common feature, often triple-arched or parabolic and some with stained glass designs. Dramatically carved doors, arched doors, and vertical panel doors are accented by patterned tiles, Solomonic columns, pilasters, or carved stonework.

The seamless flow of residential and natural spaces is aided by several features. Typically, glazed multi-pane double doors (or French doors) lead to exterior gardens, patios, and balconies. Character-defining features surrounding the house frequently include walled entry courtyards, fountains, and arcaded walkways (usually leading to a rear garden).

The Temple House is located in Salisbury, the county seat of Rowan County. It has been an important local and regional center since the mid-1700s as Salisbury was positioned near the Trading Ford on the Yadkin River, “the crossing for the north-south Wagon Road and the east-west Trading Path.” By 1860, shortly after the Western North Carolina Railroad began construction from Salisbury to Asheville, Salisbury was the fifth largest town in North Carolina. During the Civil War it was an important rail center. “By the end of the 1880s, new enterprise was emerging. The long-delayed WNCRR finally reached through Asheville to Tennessee, and the Yadkin Railroad was completed southeast to Albemarle in 1891.” In the 1880s, Salisbury’s population increased from 2,723 to 6,277, and gradually climbed to 13,884 by the 1920s. Later in the twentieth century, the community grew more slowly than other large North Carolina cities. Salisbury, thus, retains “particularly strong […] architecture from the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, with nearly every nationally popular style rendered in substantial and conservative fashion.”

While there are homes of Spanish influence in Salisbury, these local examples tend to be Spanish Mission style. The Temple House is the only known example of a one-story Spanish Colonial Revival Home centered around a courtyard. The local use of the Spanish Mission style for some residential building was likely due to the influence of Frank P. Milburn’s Spanish Mission design for the 1907 Southern Railroad Passenger Depot. Architectural historian Davyd Foard Hood refers to Salisbury’s depot, which exhibits curved parapets flanking a massive central tower, as Milburn’s “virtuosic essay in the Spanish Mission.” The original Salisbury Historic District, listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1975, points out two “outstanding” examples.

---
15 McAlester (2013) pg.
16 McAlester (2013) pg.
17 McAlester (2013) pg.
20 Ibid. (Bisher, Piedmont, p. 424).
21 Hood, Rowan County Architecture, p. 304.
of Spanish Mission style, the Franklin Smith, Sr. House, at 201 S. Fulton, built ca.1910, and the house at 200 S. Jackson Street, built ca.1914 (also addressed as 301 W. Fisher St.). These two-story stucco-clad homes feature bracketed hipped roofs clad with red clay Spanish tiles, sweeping verandas and shaped gables. Built before 1920, these homes are formal two-story rectangular dwellings with Mission shaped dormers and/ or roof parapets that reflect the Spanish Mission style construction that was popular in the nineteenth century and later, but primarily before the great depression.22 Neither of these homes are individually listed in the National Register. These homes are similar to the Temple House in that they have stucco exterior covering construction and clay tile roofs. However, they do not share the essential style elements of the Spanish Colonial Revival period that are integral to the Temple House.

The 1927 Franklin Smith, Jr. House at 209 S. Fulton is also of Spanish influence but of smaller scale than the adjacent Franklin Smith, Sr. House. It has a cubic massing, stucco finish, Spanish tile hipped roof, and an arcaded porte cochere, but lacks shaped gables.23 A fourth house, at 728 North Fulton, could be classified as Spanish Colonial Revival. However, this house is a modernized version of the style that was typical in the late 1930/40s. The recorded construction date for this house is 1946. It is a simple two-story stucco dwelling. It appears, in 2008 Google Street view, to have steel casement windows and a mansard-shaped red clay tile roof. However, it now appears to have replacement windows. There is a one-story attached garage of similar design. The house has a brick chimney and minimal embellishments primarily at the eave. Additionally, there are small stucco houses scattered within the city, that resemble the stucco California bungalow tract homes that were built in the late 1940s and 1950s, but none of these homes reflect the 1920s-1930s Spanish Colonial Revival style elements that are seen in the Temple House. Although there are homes of Spanish influence in Salisbury, the Temple House is unique to Salisbury as the only known local one-story Spanish Colonial Revival style house whose design centers around an historic courtyard.

The Edgar S. and Madge Temple House is an excellent local representation of a one-story Spanish Colonial Revival style home, which was popular from the 1920s to 1940s, exhibiting a high level of integrity with its intact character-defining features of the style. On the exterior, the Temple House exhibits a complex plan with outer front-gabled sections connected by a gabled hyphen. It features a low-pitched with minimal eave overhang clad in red tile. Walls are covered with stucco. As common to the style, the Temple House has an asymmetrical façade emphasized by an off-center square entrance tower. The entrance exhibits a Renaissance-inspired door surround, and the tower is accentuated at the top by bands of tilework. The façade also features multiple arched windows, and the gable ends have arched vent openings. A stucco chimney accented with tilework and a decorative iron “S-shaped” anchor plate, is centered facing the rear courtyard. French doors between interior rooms and multiple French doors opening to the integral outdoor courtyard illustrate the typical seamless flow of residential to natural spaces. The rear French doors feature bracketed red tile shed awnings. Further emphasizing the fluid transition from interior to exterior, the first courtyard steps down to a second courtyard and tilework accents these courtyard/patio areas. North of the house are also the original stucco courtyard wall with arches at each end and an original statuary niche recessed at center. The

---


23 Hood, Rowan County, p.304.
nicho lines up with the original intact triangular fishpond. Raised planting beds and trees and
bushes planted by Mr. Temple remain intact today. The interior of the Temple House retains its
original floor plan, as well as semi-rough textured stucco walls, 2 1/4-inch tongue-in-groove red
tiger oak flooring, mosaic tile in bathrooms, unpainted stained wood window and door facings,
eight-panel wood doors, 15-light French doors, brass door hardware, most of the original ceiling
light fixtures, and a massive focal living room chimney with bracketed heavy board mantel.

Additional Historical Background

The Milford Hills subdivision, where the Temple House is located, was first offered to the public
by the Salisbury Development Company in the late 1920s. The land was conveyed subject to
restrictions on the location and costs of the dwelling. The restrictions required a dwelling to be at
least 1,000 sq. feet.24 The Temple House, built in 1936, is 2300 sq. feet.

In 1933 the Salisbury Development Company conveyed what where then referred to as lots 250
and 251. The majority of this original land conveyed to Edgar S. and Madge Temple, on which
they constructed beautiful gardens and their Spanish Colonial Revival home and courtyards is
still associated with the Temple House today. A portion of the north end of lots 250 and 251 was
split off for Temple’s youngest daughter, Sylvia.

Prior to the establishment of the Milford Hills Residential Park there were two large homes in the
area. The 1911 Grubbs-Sigmon-Weisiger House, at 213 McCoy Road, is approximately ¼ mile
southeast of the Temple House. The A.B.C. Kirk House, 1524 Statesville Blvd. (directly across
North Milford Drive from the Temple House) is a two-story, hipped roof, brick house that was
built in the mid-1920s. The Temple home was one of the earliest and largest homes constructed
in the new Milford Hills subdivision. The Milford Hills Development peaked during the late
1940s, through the late 1950s. Many of the early houses are two-story brick or wood-sided
colonial homes. By the 1950s, large brick Ranch houses were popular. The Temple family
eventually owned four lots in the development. Lot I (originally known as 250 and 251) which
was sold to the Bowyers in 1993 is the location of the house. In 1994, Lots 2, 3 and 4 were sold,
and in 1995, three new brick homes were built on these North Milford Drive facing lot. With the
development of adjacent neighborhoods, the Milford Hills area continues to be a relevant and
desirable neighborhood with newer homes constructed in 2000 through 2016 that blend with the
older established homes. The architecture of the Temple House is unique to this Salisbury
neighborhood. It is significant in Salisbury as an excellent local example of a one-story Spanish
Colonial Revival style house with courtyards/gardens, i.e. the only house of this style with the
hacienda form in the city of Salisbury.

Builder – Edgar S. Temple

24 Temple, E.S. and wife, Madge S. “Deed: Salisbury Development Co.” December 16, 1933
(Registrar’s Office, Rowan County, NC. January 27, 1934)
Edgar Temple, because of his career path, had a unique frame of reference for architecture. Mr. Temple and his wife Madge were both graduates of Lenoir College with degrees in education. During his summers as a high school student and a college student and even as a teacher, Mr. Temple worked for a landscaping and nursery business in his hometown of Hildebrand, NC. His work in landscaping taught him perspective with reference to function and design. According to interviews with family members, Temple designed his home and functioned as his own contractor using local craftsmen for the home’s construction. The house design shows the influence of noted Spanish Colonial Revival architects such as George Washington Smith, Bertram Goodhue and Lilian J. Rice. The home’s informal style which is a hallmark for 1920s-1940s period of Spanish Colonial Revival architecture makes the home feel comfortable and natural.

The couple married during their senior year of college and after graduation began their teaching careers in the Uwharrie, NC schools. The next year they moved to Moore County, NC. Mr. Temple became the principal of Moore County’s Cameron High School. Mr. Temple attended the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill during the summers and received a Master’s Degree in Education. The Temples left Moore County in 1932, and Mr. Temple took a position as a professor of education at the then newly, reorganized Rutherford College at Rutherford Station, NC. In 1933, North Carolina Methodist colleges were consolidated. Rutherford College closed, and Brevard College became the only NC mountain area Methodist college.

Mr. Temple saw this change as an opportunity to start the business and career that he had always wanted. For the next year, he worked for a Hildebrand, NC nursery, the Howard Hickory Nursery, as a salesman. He had worked for the business when he was in high school and college and had learned the landscape trade through experience.

During their early marriage, the Temples used their summer vacations from teaching to explore the United States. They visited the 1933 Chicago World’s Fair, and they drove and camped cross country to California. During these adventures, the Temples became fascinated by new ideas in building and home design. Their travels inspired Mr. Temple’s home design.

In December of 1933, the Temples purchased two tracts of land, approximately four acres, from the Salisbury Development Company, which was the developer of the Milford Hills Residential Park. Construction of the house began in 1934 and the home was completed in 1936. Mr. Temple’s creative talents are seen across many Salisbury business and residential landscapes. He created exceptional landscaping for St John’s Lutheran Church which is a downtown landmark. When working on landscapes for the church’s new buildings in 1968,
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27 Madge Sigmon Temple. “Daddy’s School Teaching Information” (dictated to daughter Elaine in 1990)
28 Temple, “Daddy’s School Teaching Information”
29 Madge Sigmon Temple, “Personal writing for her 50th, Lenoir-Rhyne College Reunion.” (1977)
he discovered one of Salisbury’s original five wells. His careful handling of this historical site enabled the establishment of a well house that marked the location of the historic well.

Mr. Temple worked as a contractor for the US Veterans Administration and was instrumental in the development of landscaping for the local Veterans’ Hospital. Temple was also the landscape contractor for the historic National Military Cemetery in Salisbury. When the cemetery administration decided to dispose of a gazebo that had been placed in the cemetery in the 1870s, Mr. Temple purchased the gazebo, restored it, and placed it on a flagstone pad in his home garden. After the death of Edgar and after Madge Temple left the house for health reasons, Mrs. Temple directed her children to give the gazebo to the city of Salisbury. It now stands as a prime landmark in the downtown Salisbury Bell Tower Park. (The Veterans Administration in Salisbury was contacted about records of Mr. Temple’s work. Unfortunately, the VA does not keep records of contracted work.) Mr. Temple also worked for the Rowan County Government/School System. He designed and built the football fields for East, West, South, and North Rowan High Schools. Work on the football field is verified through family interviews, and word of mouth from local historians, however, the Rowan County school system records prior to the Salisbury / Rowan County school consolidation are not available. Local newspaper records for that time are not digitalized.

Mr. Temple’s house is a tribute to his creativity and his understanding of function in design. He embraced the features of the Spanish Colonial Revival style of architecture and included each style element in his home design. It is a tribute to his vision that without additions or interior changes, the house is as livable for a family in 2020, as it was when it was built in 1936.

30 “St. Johns Well.” St John’s Journal, (Vol. 15. No. 6, Salisbury, NC. Summer 1968)

31 “Relocated Gazebo Officially Given to Salisbury.” Salisbury Post, (Salisbury, NC April 31, 1993)
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preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
previously listed in the National Register
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designated a National Historic Landmark
recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #
recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #
recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey #

Primary location of additional data:
X State Historic Preservation Office
Other State agency
Federal agency
Local government
University
Other
Name of repository: ________________________________

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned): RW2134

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property 1.255

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates
Datum if other than WGS84: ________________________
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

1. Latitude: 36.692675 Longitude: -80.505464
2. Latitude: Longitude:
3. Latitude: Longitude:
4. Latitude: Longitude:

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)
The National Register Boundary for the Temple House is Rowan County Tax Parcel 
# 333 092 as represented on the enclosed National Register Boundary Map by the bold white 
line. Total acreage is 1.255.

**Boundary Justification** (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The selected boundary encompasses the residual portion of the original land conveyed to the 
Temples by the Salisbury Development Company in 1933 (originally referred to as lots 250 
and 251, it was deeded to the current owners as a single “lot 1”). It excludes the portions of 
the original conveyance to the north that were split off in 1993 and conveyed to Madge and 
Edgar Temple’s youngest daughter, Sylvia. That newly created parcel contains a more-
recently constructed home. The selected National Boundary includes the contributing 
Temple House, contributing site with landscape features, and two contributing outbuildings 
north of the house, the ca.1936 two-story garage and the chicken house. The selected 
boundary includes sufficient historic acreage and setting to convey the Spanish Colonial 
Revival significance of the Temple House. The entire included lot was designated by Edgar 
Temple as his home site and private garden. The garden areas are relevant to the house 
because they are a continuation of and compliment to the overall Spanish Colonial Revival 
form and are an integral part of E.S. Temple’s design.

11. Form Prepared By

name/title: _Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer__

organization: N/A

street & number: _1604 Statesville Boulevard_

city or town: _Salisbury_ state: _NC_ zip code: _28144_

e-mail _N/A_

telephone: _N/A_

date: _12-7-2020_

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property’s 
  location.

- **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous 
  resources. Key all photographs to this map.
Additional items: (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)

Photographs
Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer, photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.

Photo Log
Name of Property: Temple, Edgar S. and Madge, House
City or Vicinity: Salisbury
County: Rowan  State: North Carolina
Photographer: Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer
Date Photographed:
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:
1 of ___.

National Register Photo Selection T.B.D.
Tier 4 – 280 hours

The above estimates include time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and preparing and transmitting nominations. Send comments regarding these estimates or any other aspect of the requirement(s) to the Service Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service, 1201 Oakridge Drive Fort Collins, CO 80525.
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North Carolina
National Register Location Map
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Created by Hannah Beckman-Black 11-30-2020
Edgar S. and Madge Temple House
1604 Statesville Boulevard
Salisbury, Rowan County
North Carolina
National Register Boundary Map

Boundary encompasses
tax parcel number
333 092, indicated by
the thick white line.

Source: NC HPO, HPOWEB
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Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Please Select Submission Category:  
☐ Public  ☐ Council  ☐ Manager  ☑ Staff

Requested Council Meeting Date:  January 19, 2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request:  Kelly Baker, Graham Corriher

Name of Presenter(s):  Strategics Consultants Leslie Mozingo and Ron Hamm

Requested Agenda Item:  Council to consider adopting the 2021 Federal Action Plan.

Description of Requested Agenda Item:  After meeting with Council members and department directors, Strategics Consulting has drafted a 2021 Federal Action Plan for Council's consideration.

Attachments:  ☑ Yes  ☐ No

Fiscal Note:  (If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)


Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Graham Corriher
               Kelly Baker

☐ Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)

☑ Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

________________________________________________________________________
Finance Manager Signature                                Department Head Signature

________________________________________________________________________
Budget Manager Signature

****All agenda items must be submitted at least 7 days before the requested Council meeting date****

For Use in Clerk's Office Only

☐ Approved  ☐ Delayed  ☐ Declined
## 2021 (FY22) FEDERAL ACTION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROJECTS AND POLICY NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td><strong>EMPIRE HOTEL</strong>: Funding needed to complete the restoration and redevelopment of this historic property located in the heart of downtown, and fully within a federal Opportunity Zone, as well as plan for surrounding area improvements.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>BROADBAND</strong>: Subsidy for cost of services and make system improvements.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>MAIN STREET IMPROVEMENTS</strong>: Support the improvements as outlined in the approved master plan.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION</strong>: Need funds to help neighborhoods such as West End, East End, Park Ave., and former Kesler Mill area.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>DIXONVILLE-LINCOLN MEMORIAL</strong>: Funding to support project honoring and recognizing City’s African-American residents.  &lt;br&gt;  - <strong>Lincoln School Revitalization</strong>: Funding to transform long-vacant African-American elementary school into useful space, such as senior housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF LIFE</td>
<td><strong>COVID 19</strong>: Ensure that federal funding reaches intended recipients and does not put undue burden on local governments (State Maintenance Assistance Program was reduced for transit when COVID funds for transit agencies became available). Also provided funding to continue supporting the needs of first responders.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>HOUSING</strong>: Funding and policies that rehabilitate blighted houses in established communities to create affordable housing for low-to-moderate income families. Seek federal support for the development of housing for seniors and the homeless.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>FARMERS MARKET</strong>: Funding to support additional services.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT</strong>: Support County, Chamber, academic institutions and other community partners by supporting their applications for federal assistance, particularly training funds.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>RE-ENTRY / SECOND CHANCE</strong>: Funding to support local initiatives to reduce societal and legal barriers for ex-offenders to become productive members of the community to improve public safety, strengthen families, and grow our economy.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>CLEANER ENVIRONMENT</strong>: Support programs for energy efficient vehicles, equipment and buildings, and policies that support local efforts to address waste reduction and recycling challenges.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>PARKS AND RECREATION</strong>: Funding for federal programs to support local community parks and recreation centers (LWCF Stateside Assistance).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC SAFETY

POLICE:
- Funds to address rise in domestic violence, innovative policing initiatives, DNA collection and preservation, gang suppression and violent crime reduction.
- Police training to help build racial equity in the justice system, as well as mental health crisis intervention training.
- Remove match requirements for COPS hiring to recognize budget impacts from COVID, support efforts to improve recruitment (student loan forgiveness for serving years in sworn position), and fund smaller jurisdictions with high crime.

FIRE:
- Support fire suppression initiatives, including infrastructure, equipment, and training.
- Emergency Operation Center.

OPIOIDS: Secure grant funding to help the City and local community partners battle the opioid epidemic, such as Rowan County’s need for treatment center.

TRANSPORTATION:
- Greenway enhancements and expansion, bicycle routes and safe routes to schools.
- Road and bridge improvements.
- Funding to replace transit fares lost due to COVID 19, and to expand route service, including East Spencer and Spencer.

WATER/SEWER AND STORMWATER:
- Upgrade aging water infrastructure that replace lead pipes and reduce lead exposure.
- Assist smaller, stressed systems and promote regional water and wastewater systems.
- Support policies that provide Clean Water Act (CWA) regulatory relief.
- Support initiatives to reduce PFAS and lead contamination.
- Prompt implementation by the owners of the High Rock Dam a well-engineered Sedimentation and Flood Protection Plan for the City’s raw water pump station and related infrastructure that secures the public water supply for 52,000 customers of SRU.
- Seek federal support for stream restoration.
- Oppose policies that place unfunded mandates on local governments under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permitting process.

For more information contact Leslie Mozingo, (202) 255-5760, leslie@strategics.consulting or Ron Hamm, (202) 596-8384, rhamm@hammconsulting.com.
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Please Select Submission Category:  ☒ Public  □ Council  □ Manager  ☒ Staff

Requested Council Meeting Date:  January 19, 2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request:  Community Planning Services

Name of Presenter(s):  Candace Edwards, Housing Planner; Hannah Jacobson, Community Planning Services Director

Requested Agenda Item:  Council to consider adoption of an amendment to the FY 20-21 CDBG Action Plan outlining a recommended budget for the use of Community Development Block Grant funding to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus (CDBG-CV) through the CARES Act.

Description of Requested Agenda Item:

The City of Salisbury is eligible for a second allocation of CDBG-CV funds in the amount of $200,221. In order to access the funding, the City must approve an amendment to the FY 20-21 Action Plan that outlines a budget for the additional funds. City Council held a public hearing on December 1, 2020 to gather input on how the funds could best help the community. The comment period remained open until December 25th, 2020. Comments received are summarized in Attachment A. Staff presented a draft Action Plan Amendment on January 5, 2021. The period to comment on the draft ended on January 12, 2021. The attached memo and presentation outline the recommended budget for the use of the CDBG-CV funds.

Attachments:  ☒ Yes  □ No

- Memo: Staff Recommended CDBG-CB Budget and Action Plan Amendment
- Attachment A: Public Comments Received

Fiscal Note:  (If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item:  Consider adoption of an amendment to the FY 20-21 CDBG Action Plan concerning the use of Community Development Block Grant funding to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus (CDBG-CV) through the CARES Act.

Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Hannah Jacobson, Community Planning Services, (704) 638-5230, hannah.jacobson@salisburycity.gov.
  Candace Edwards, Housing Planner, (704) 638-5324, Candace.edwards@salisburycity.gov.

☐ Consent Agenda  (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)
Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________ _____________________________
Finance Manager Signature                     Department Head Signature

_________________________________
Budget Manager Signature

****All agenda items must be submitted at least 7 days before the requested Council meeting date***

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved  ☐ Declined

Reason:
To: Salisbury City Council  
From: Hannah Jacobson, Planning Director  
Through: W. Lane Bailey, City Manager  
Subject: Staff Recommended CDBG – CV Budget and Action Plan Amendment

Summary: The City of Salisbury is eligible for a second allocation of CDBG-CV funds in the amount of $200,221. In order to access the funding, the City must approve an amendment to the FY 20-21 Action Plan that outlines a budget for the additional funds. City Council held a public hearing on December 1, 2020 to gather input on how the funds could best help the community. The comment period remained open until December 25th, 2020. Comments received are summarized in Attachment A. The memo below outlines staff’s recommended budget for the use of the CDBG-CV funds.

Background:

CDBG - CV Round 1

On April 2, 2020 the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) announced an allocation of $168,950 in CDBG funding to Salisbury to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus (CDBG-CV). On June 2, 2020, City Council adopted an amendment to Salisbury’s FY19-20 Action Plan that committed 100 percent of those funds to public service agencies (sub-recipients) who assist low-income individuals and families impacted by COVID-19. After a call-for-applications, ten sub-recipients were endorsed by Council. Staff has been working with these agencies to sign appropriate contracts, submit reimbursement requests, and appropriately track their activities needed for HUD reporting. There is a remaining balance of $34,834 that can still be distributed to public service agencies.

CDBG – CV Round 2

On September 11, 2020 the City was notified of a second allocation of CDBG-CV funds in the amount of $200,221. To deploy these funds, Council will have to adopt an amendment to the FY20-21 Annual Action Plan to describe, broadly speaking, how the funds will be utilized. City Council held a public hearing on December 1 and opened a public comment period that ended on December 25, 2020. A draft was presented at the January 5, 2021 City Council meeting, and a public comment period closed on January 12, 2021.

Informed by public comments, Staff is recommending the CDBG-CV funds used to address the following needs:
1. **Public Services.** Public service agencies need continued support, particularly those that address mental health, food distribution, and domestic violence. Staff recommends opening up another ‘call for applications’ and advertising community wide, similar to the process used in Spring 2020. There is still a balance of $34,834 that has not yet been committed to agencies from the first round of CDBG-CV.

2. **Rent and Utility Assistance.** In the first round of CDBG-CV, Rowan Helping Ministries (RHM) received $25,500 to provide rent and utility assistance. In addition to funds they have received from the City, several other large sums of funding have been received from other governmental and nongovernmental sources that must be expended immediately. RHM’s award has been increased to $1,900,000 to assist Rowan County residents through the HOPE Program. Over 500 Rowan County household applied to the HOPE program. The opportunity to apply was closed on November 11th leaving residents with no assistance after that date. RHM has processed over half of the applications and are on track to assist all who applied before the end of the application period.

   Outside of the HOPE program RHM is receiving approximately 100 applications from Rowan County residents seeking financial assistance for rent and utilities weekly. Currently, the organization is using donor funds (including Share2Care funds for Salisbury Water customers) to assist those who are in crisis. They note that it is important to encourage residents to request a payment plan with utility providers and work to resolve their crisis this way prior to applying for assistance so that we focus on the most urgent needs.

3. **Emergency Sewer Lateral Repair Assistance.** During COVID-19, OneStop and Salisbury Rowan Utilities (SRU) is seeing an increase in the number of residents needing emergency repairs to the sewer lateral line connecting their home to the street. Damage is often due to collapse of old terra cotta materials or the intrusion of tree roots, and causes a significant health hazard. The cost of transferring a private lateral line to the public system is $1,975. The cost of SRU simply repairing the private lateral line is approximately $500-$700. Currently, no payment relief (grants or loans) exist for low income people to apply to for assistance. Creation of an assistance program, which could be administered either through One Stop, SRU or possibly Rowan Helping Ministries, would greatly help low income people who are facing a health and safety crisis.

4. **Homeless Prevention Coordination.** Despite efforts such as foreclosure prevention or rent/utility assistance to keep people in their homes, it is very likely there will continue to be an uptick in the number of homeless people and families in the City. Coordination is needed that brings together all players – the Continuum of Care, Rowan County, RHM, business stakeholders, City Departments, and United Way, and others. Efforts are already underway within several uncoordinated groups in the City. A coordinated effort to move the City towards tackling some of the underlying issues related to
homelessness would prove more than beneficial for public services agencies, local businesses, and citizens alike.

5. Small Business Assistance. Small businesses have been hurt by the pandemic more than others, and CDBG-CV funds can be used to create or fund small business assistance programs. Morganton and Hickory are just two examples of communities that use the annual allocation of CDBG funds to fund a small business loan or grant program, while many others have used the CDBG-CV funds for emergency, micro grants. Rowan County has just closed their small business grant application period. Options exist for how to utilize the funds:
   - Establish a small business grant program similar to the program created by Rowan County.
     - Pro: Familiar to small businesses, could be offered relatively soon
     - Con: Administration of the program could consume a portion of the budget
   - Invest funds into the KIVA platform, a crowdsourced loan/grant program that is being established in Salisbury region.
     - Pro: Management of funds occurs through the Hub (Self Help Credit Union)
     - Con: New and untested platform in Salisbury

Available Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CDBG-CV 1st Round (remaining)</strong></td>
<td>$34,834</td>
<td>Must be spent on public service activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CDBG-CV 2nd Round</strong></td>
<td>$200,221</td>
<td>May be spent on public service, housing activities, planning, economic development, infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funds</strong></td>
<td>$235,055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended Program Budget

The chart below represents staff’s recommended budget to fund the community needs described above.
Recommended Action Plan Amendment

In order to access the funds, Staff will need to submit to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) an amendment to the FY 20-21 Action Plan. All of the programs described above are eligible activities for funding and are in support of the goals in Salisbury’s 5-Year Consolidated Plan. Below is a table showing the recommended amendments.
## Consolidated Plan Goal

**Consolidated Plan Goal** | **Adopted Action Plan Budget** | **Amended Action Plan**
--- | --- | ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Program</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
<th><strong>Program</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Increase Supply of Decent Affordable Housing
- **Owner Occupied Rehab Program**
  - **CDBG:** $113,674
  - **HOME:** $97,200
- **No Change**

### Improve Public Facilities and Infrastructure ¹
- **Lash Drive Sidewalk Project**
  - **CDBG:** $46,084
- **Ryan Street Sidewalk Project**
- **Emergency Sewer Lateral Repair**
  - **CDBG-CV:** $10,000
- **No Change**

### Provide Opportunities for Homeownership
- **Down Payment Assistance**
  - **HOME:** $20,000
- **No Change**

### Provide Assistance to Public Service Agencies ²
- **Public Service Direct Support**
  - **CDBG:** $46,084
  - **Public Service Call for Applications:**
    - **CDBG-CV:** $15,221
  - **Rent and Utility Assistance:**
    - **CDBG-CV:** $75,000
- **No Change**

### Promote Business Growth and a Robust Workforce
- **No projects identified in FY 20-21**
- **Small Business Assistance**
  - **CDBG-CV:** $60,000
- **No Change**

### Affirmatively further Fair Housing
- **No projects identified in FY 20-21**
- **No Change**

### Effectively Plan and Administer Programs ³
- **Administration**
  - **CDBG:** $61,445
  - **HOME:** $7,476
  - **Homelessness Prevention Strategy**
    - **CDBG-CV:** $40,000
  - **CDGB: 61,443 HOME:$7,052**

Notes:

1. Staff is recommending that Ryan Street from Celebration Drive to Old Concord Road be prioritized in FY 20-21. Cost estimates for Lash Drive exceeded available budget. Ryan Drive connects a low income housing development to a future sidewalk improvement on Old Concord Road.

2. While only $15,221 is recommended to be distributed to public service agencies from this allocation of CDBG-CV, there is a remaining $34,834 that can still be used from the first allocation in the Spring. Therefore, a total of $50,055 would be available.

3. A minor error in HUD’s allocation needs to be rectified. The impact of the error is a reduction of less than $500.

CC:
- Zack Kyle, Assistant City Manager
- Candace Edwards, Housing Planner
December 9, 2020

Our award has been increased to $1,900,000 to assist Rowan County residents through the HOPE Program. Over 500 Rowan County households applied to the HOPE program. The opportunity to apply was closed on Nov 11. We have processed over half of the applications and are on track to assist all who have applied.

Outside of the HOPE program we are receiving about 100 applications from Rowan County residents seeking financial assistance for rent and utilities. We are using donor funds (including Share2Care funds for Salisbury Water customers) to assist those who are in crisis and either missed the HOPE program deadline or did not qualify. It is important to encourage residents to request a payment plan with utility providers and work to resolve their crisis this way prior to applying for assistance so that we focus on the most urgent needs.

Feel free to call me for clarification.

Thank you!

Kyna S Grubb
Executive Director
Rowan Helping Ministries
226 North Long Street
Salisbury, NC 28144
704-637-6838 ext. 101

December 17, 2020

GM Candace!

Thanks so much for reaching out with this info. I’m still teleworking from home, so cc’d Joseph Dismuke and Chavonne Greer at the Career Center on any ideas they may have as the center is providing direct services to customers. As you may recall, Chavonne is the Certified Reentry Specialist, serving the particularly disenfranchised justice involved. The feedback I’m getting region wide is struggles to get IDs, SS cards, (needed for employment) and stable housing. As DPS is early releasing to ELM any individuals who qualify, these folks are leaving the camps even less prepared for reentry than pre-pandemic. Great cause for concern.
I’m also attaching an email from Gary Rhodes wanting to ramp up Rowan LRC efforts. You, or a colleague from your department, should be at the table. You may want to contact Gary or Scott Idol. Stay safe and well...Janie

Janie Rollins, MHDL, GCDF
Regional Reentry Specialist
North Carolina Department of Commerce

December 17, 2020

Hi Candace,

Thank you for making us aware of this opportunity to share how the funds can have a greater impact. We had applied the first opportunity to funding to assist in providing support for students during their virtual academic days. It seems that the school year may look much like it does currently for the remainder of the year. Power Cross is striving daily to support these kids, but virtual academics is a huge challenge for both our students and their parents. With additional funding we can hire more virtual academic facilitators to help our students during this challenging academic time. Without support in very small groups the time is very challenging to make a dent in the children's work and actually teach them at the same time. If we had $20,000 we could spend it all very quickly providing support for the students. To me this is a very large need in the community. While we have the students we also feed them and provide their transportation so the expense to running our whole program at the larger scale we are now is challenging. Support for more virtual academic assistance would be huge!

Have a blessed day,

Natalie Storment- Power Cross Co-Founder
nat@powercross.org
www.powercross.org
704-402-8011

December 17, 2020

Due to COVID-19, our nonprofit organization The Music House, Inc. had to halt piano lessons preventing us from saving extra money to renovate lesson space. Because of our suspended services, we became behind on renovation funds and would like to apply for funding to recoup our losses and complete renovations.

Destiny Stone
119 Cedar Drive, Apt. D
Salisbury, NC 28147
Mental Health is more important than ever. We are inundated with clients and will be moving to a larger facility hopefully next week. So much depression due to Covid. We are now transporting our patients to ALL their MD appointments as we can treat them successfully without their other medical needs taken care of. Many have diabetes, high blood pressure, etc. We are seeing a lot of minority patients and they suffer from the above. Their physical health is important. We also are joining the food bank in Charlotte. We will not be duplicating services only adding staples as they can only get food monthly from area food banks. Let me know when applications open up.

- One Love Community Clinic
Dear Salisbury City Council Members,

Last year was very difficult for many of our neighbors who struggled to deal with the COVID pandemic and sought crisis assistance services at Rowan Helping Ministries. We are thankful for the many ways our city and county officials ensured that our citizens had access to emergency funding, including CDBG funds, that came into our community from the federal level.

Once the moratorium on utility shut offs ended and the eviction moratorium was looming ahead, Rowan Helping Ministries began hearing from our neighbors who were experiencing unprecedented financial crisis. We are now wrapping up the Hope Program which assisted over 400 Rowan County households who had a COVID 19-related crisis. We distributed more than $1.3 million in financial assistance to keep these citizens in their homes with their utilities on. The HOPE Program funding our county received allowed us to provide households up to 6 months of rent and back utilities, thus meeting the full need and truly bridging the financial crisis gap. In addition to the HOPE program, we provided $58,000 from our traditional crisis assistance funds, the city’s CDBG funds, and Share2Care Funds to help 58 households with financial crises unrelated to the pandemic.

The ability to truly resolve the crisis through the HOPE Program prompts us to request funding from CDBG to continue helping Salisbury residents at a higher funding level. The range of assistance we provided was between $500 and $6,000 per household. As mentioned previously, this pandemic has created an unprecedented crisis which requires more than the usual assistance agencies like ours have been able to provide through traditional community donations. We would like to request from the City funding to provide up to $2,700 per Salisbury household seeking assistance to prevent eviction or utility shut off because of a COVID-related financial crisis. This support, combined with Share2Care funds, will make the difference between our neighbors simply getting by or truly catching up to get ahead in their lives.

Thank you for your support and leadership,

Kyna S. Grubb
Executive Director
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Please Select Submission Category:  [ ] Public  [ ] Council  [ ] Manager  [x] Staff

Requested Council Meeting Date:  01/19/2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request:  Community Planning Services

Name of Presenter(s):  Catherine Garner

Requested Agenda Item:  Z-01-2020 – 0 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave., Parcel ID 060 190

Description of Requested Agenda Item:  Z-01-2020: Request to rezone one (1) parcel on the south side of S. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave. approximately 255 feet to the south of the intersection of S. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue and Mooresville Road (PID 060 190) from Corridor Mixed Use (CMX) and Highway Business (HB) to Highway Business (HB).

Attachments:  [x] Yes  [ ] No

Fiscal Note:  (If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item:  (Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)
Council to consider adopting an ordinance to rezone the subject parcel as requested.

Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Catherine Garner, catherine.garner@salisburync.gov, 704-638-5212

[ ] Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)
[ ] Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

______________________________
Finance Manager Signature

Hannah Jacobson

______________________________
Department Head Signature

______________________________
Budget Manager Signature

****All agenda items must be submitted at least 7 days before the requested Council meeting date****
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Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

☐ Approved  ☐ Delayed  ☐ Declined

Reason:
FILING DATE: 10.07.2020

PETITION TYPE

☐ General Rezoning (LDO Sec. 15.21)
☐ Petition involves entire parcel(s) as shown on the Rowan County tax map
☐ Petition involves a portion of a parcel(s) as shown on the Rowan County tax map
☐ Petitioner is the property owner of record
☐ Petitioner is an entity requesting a 3rd-party rezoning
☐ City-Initiated rezoning

EXISTING DISTRICT(S): CMX/HP
PROPOSED DISTRICT(S): HB

GENERAL PROPERTY DESCRIPTION (ESPECIALLY IF UNADDRESSED)

PROPERTY & CONTACT INFORMATION

Rowan County Parcel ID(s): 060-190
Address or Site Location: Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd, South
Subdivision:  
Lot(s):  
Petitioner: Partners In Learning Child Development Center, Inc.
Address: 2386 Robin Road, Salisbury, NC 28144
Email: norma@apartnersinlearning.org  Best Phone: 704-683-9020
Owner (if different than petitioner): rap for petitioner: Bill Wagoner, board of trustees
Address: P.O. Box 1127 Salisbury, NC 28145
Email: bwagoner@wagonerconstruction.com Daytime Phone: 704-642-2571

SIGNATURE

By signing this petition you understand that this petition will be forwarded to the Planning Board (a City Council-appointed board) who may hear statements from staff, the petitioner, and general public, and will then vote to make a Statement of Consistency and recommendation to City Council. The petition will then be forwarded to City Council who will conduct the official public hearing before casting a deciding vote.

Petitioner (or representative): Norma W. Honeycutt / Exec. Director

Application Last Revised: JAN 2019
DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

INITIAL PLANNING BOARD DATE: ___/___/20___

- IF SENT TO LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
  - ASSIGNED LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE:
  - LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
  - DATE OF INITIAL COMMITTEE MEETING: ___/___/20___
  - DATE OF ADDITIONAL MEETINGS: ___/___/20___
  - COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

- PLANNING BOARD STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY & RECOMMENDATION:
  - DATE OF RECOMMENDATION: ___/___/20___
  - VOTE: (___)
  - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR FILE:

INITIAL CITY COUNCIL DATE: ___/___/20___

- IF SENT TO COUNCIL COMMITTEE
  - COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
  - DATE OF INITIAL COMMITTEE MEETING: ___/___/20___
  - DATE OF ADDITIONAL MEETINGS: ___/___/20___
  - COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION?

- CITY COUNCIL STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY & REASONABLENESS:

- DECISION:
  - DATE OF DECISION: ___/___/20___
  - VOTE: (___)
  - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR FILE:
## Planning & Zoning Analysis

### CASE NO.

| Z-01-2020 |

### Petitioner(s)

| Partners in Learning Child Development Center, Inc. |

### Owner(s)

| Partners in Learning Child Development Center, Inc. |

### Representative(s)

| Bill Wagoner |

### Address

| Unnumbered S Martin Luther King Jr Ave. |

### Tax Map & Parcel(s)

| 060 190 |

### Size / Scope

| 8.24 acres encompassing one (1) parcel |

### Location

| Parcel is located on the south side of S. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue, approximately 255 feet to the south of the intersection of S. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue and Mooresville Road |

### PETITIONER REQUEST

| Request: Petition proposes request to amend the Land Development Ordinance district map by rezoning one (1) parcel approximately 8.24 acres from Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX) and Highway Business (HB) to Highway Business (HB). |

| Staff Comments: The petitioner is requesting to rezone the parcel to Highway Business (HB) in order to clean up existing split zoning. The rezoning request is not a Conditional District rezoning request; thus, if approved, all development would have to conform to the requirements of the HB zoning district as adopted. |

| Uses: All permitted uses in the HB zoning district would be permitted per the LDO Chapter 2 Use Matrix. This request is not a conditional district zoning request; therefore, all uses will be permitted per the existing Use Matrix. |

City Council received a presentation on this text amendment and held a public hearing at the last meeting on January 5, 2021. Staff has not received any comments following the public hearing. Please consider adoption of this ordinance amendment at the January 19, 2021 City Council meeting.
CHARACTER OF AREA

Overview:

The parcel (Parcel ID 060 190) is currently vacant. The majority of the parcel was previously cleared and consists of grasses with a wooded boundary along the side and rear property lines. The only access is via S Martin Luther King Jr. Ave. The parcels abut vacant parcels on the eastern and southern boundaries. Car dealerships and industrial facilities are located on the wester, southwestern, and northern boundaries.

Surrounding Land Use(s) & Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Land Uses</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North of area</td>
<td>Vacant, Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>LI, HI, CMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of area</td>
<td>Vacant, office space, residential (facing Klumac Road)</td>
<td>CMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of area</td>
<td>Car dealerships, vacant</td>
<td>HB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of area</td>
<td>Car dealerships, vacant</td>
<td>HB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFRASTRUCTURE & CIVIC/COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Public Schools:

Elementary: Koontz
Middle: Knox / Henderson
High: Salisbury / Henderson

Fire District:

Station 2

Utilities

Water & Sewer:

Public water and sewer are available within the S Martin Luther King Jr. Ave. right-of-way. Individual taps to serve future facilities on this parcel will be evaluated as part of construction document review.

Transportation

Transit:

Route #1 serves S Martin Luther King Jr. Ave
### Planning & Zoning Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Access(s):</th>
<th>The proposed primary means of ingress &amp; egress is via S. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave. Parking lot stubs will be required per Section 10.6 of the LDO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Improvements:</td>
<td>S. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave. is a city-maintained street and is fully constructed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Environment

### Topography / Hydrology:

The site is relatively flat from front to back and side to side with a slight rise to the center of the property.

### Flood Hazard / Streams / Wetlands:

The site is not encumbered by any streams, flood hazards, or wetlands as identified on the City’s GIS maps.

## Comprehensive & Area Plans

### Applicable Plans:

- **Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan**
  - Demand for large scale commercial, institutional, and manufacturing facilities should continue to be met in locations buffered from neighborhoods. Buffering may be accomplished by transitional land use (preferred), by screening, or by distance, if necessary. Access to these areas by means other than the private automobile, should be designed into the original development plans.

- **Neighborhood Policy Recommendation Principle #6**
  - Locate major traffic generators only on the corners of the neighborhood planning area.

## Planning Board

### Recommendation:

This proposal was presented to Planning Board at their courtesy hearing on December 8, 2020. The Planning Board heard from Bill Wagoner, agent for the applicant. No one attended to speak regarding the application. After deliberation, the Planning Board unanimously of members present to recommend approval, stating the proposal is consistent with Vision 2020.
Z-01-2020:  
0 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave; 
PID 060 190 
Partners in Learning Child Development Center – owner/applicant 
Bill Wagoner - agent 

**Request** 
- Rezone one (1) parcel from Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX) and Highway Business (HB) to Highway Business (HB).

- Parcel is currently vacant

- Located approximately 255 feet to the south of the intersection of S. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave and Mooresville Road.
## Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASE DISTRICT</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>Assigned District</th>
<th>Planned Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached Multi</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached Multi</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inn</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child on House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child on Large Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Work Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Care Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Use Matrix

| BASE DISTRICT | OSP | RR | GR | UR | HR | BMX | NMX | CMX | DMX | BH | LI | HI | HS | CI | MHD | TND |
|---------------|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| **Office / Service (cont.)** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| Office Supply | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
| Marketing / Sales |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| **Retail / Restaurant** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| Small Retail / Food | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
| Large Retail / Food |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| **Entertainment / Recreation** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| Recreation Center | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
| **Manufacturing / Wholesale / Storage** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| Manufacturing, Light | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
| Manufacturing, Heavy |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| wholesale, Retail, < 100k |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| wholesale, Retail, > 100k |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| **Civic / Institutional** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| School, Office | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
| **Transportation / Infrastructure** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| Public Transportation | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |

### Use Matrix

| BASE DISTRICT | OSP | RR | GR | UR | HR | BMX | NMX | CMX | DMX | BH | LI | HI | HS | CI | MHD | TND |
|---------------|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| **Office / Service (cont.)** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| Office Supply | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
| Marketing / Sales |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| **Retail / Restaurant** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| Small Retail / Food | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
| Large Retail / Food |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| **Entertainment / Recreation** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| Recreation Center | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
| **Manufacturing / Wholesale / Storage** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| Manufacturing, Light | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
| Manufacturing, Heavy |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| wholesale, Retail, < 100k |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| wholesale, Retail, > 100k |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| **Civic / Institutional** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| School, Office | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
| **Transportation / Infrastructure** |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |     |     |
| Public Transportation | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑   | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑  | ☑   | ☑   |
Applicable Vision 2020 Statements

• **General Policy Recommendation 2:** Demand for large scale commercial, institutional, and manufacturing facilities should continue to be met in locations buffered from neighborhoods. Buffering may be accomplished by transitional land use (preferred), by screening, or by distance, if necessary. Access to these areas by means other than the private automobile, should be designed into the original development plans.

Applicable Vision 2020 Statement

• **Neighborhood Policy Recommendation Principle #6:** Locate major traffic generators only on the corners of the neighborhood planning area.
Salisbury City Council
Statement of Consistency & Zoning Recommendation

DISTRICT MAP AMENDMENT:  Z-01-2020

Project Title:  Z-01-2020
Petitioner(s):  Partners in Learning Child Development Center
Owner(s):  Partners in Learning Child Development Center
Representative(s) or Developer(s):  Bill Wagoner, agent
Tax Map - Parcel(s):  060 190
Size / Scope:  Approximately 8.24 acres encompassing one (1) parcel
Location:  Parcel is located on the south side of S. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue, approximately 255 feet to the south of the intersection of S. Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue and Mooresville Road.

REQUEST:

Request to amend the Land Development District Map by rezoning one (1) parcel at 0 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave. PID 010 190 from ‘HIGHWAY BUSINESS (HB)’ and ‘CORRIDOR MIXED USE (CMX)’ to ‘HIGHWAY BUSINESS (HB)’.

STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY & RECOMMENDATION:

The Salisbury City Council held a public hearing and reviewed the petition on January 5, 2021. The Council finds that the rezoning petition of the aforementioned parcels are NOT INCONSISTENT with the Salisbury Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan, is reasonable, and in the public interest because:

This specific rezoning action is not inconsistent of the comprehensive plan nor violates the goals, objectives, or policies of the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan.
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT MAP OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, REZONING 8.24 ACRES KNOWN AS PARCEL ID 060 190 FROM HIGHWAY BUSINESS (HB) AND CORRIDOR MIXED USE (CMX) TO HIGHWAY BUSINESS (HB). (PETITION NO. Z-01-2020)

WHEREAS, a petition to rezone the properties described herein was properly filed by the City of Salisbury; and

WHEREAS, the Salisbury Planning Board, an advisory board to the Salisbury City Council, reviewed the rezoning petition on December 8, 2020, unanimously voted to recommend approval as submitted, and stated that the request is consistent with the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a properly-noticed public hearing at the regularly-scheduled City Council meeting of January 5, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby finds and determines that adoption of an Ordinance to rezone the properties described herein, as requested, are NOT INCONSISTENT with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan due to the proposed petition, site characteristics, surrounding development pattern, and observations provided by city planning staff, identifying there are no policies in direct opposition to the petition.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Salisbury, North Carolina:

SECTION 1. That properties identified in the City of Salisbury and Rowan County as Tax Map 060 Parcel(s) 190 including those abutting rights-of-way and reaching to the respective centerlines, as designated on the official property identification maps of Rowan County, is hereby rezoned to ‘HB’ district.

SECTION 2. That all Ordinances, or parts of Ordinances, in conflict with this Ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict;

SECTION 3. That this Ordinance shall be effective from and after its passage.
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Please Select Submission Category:  ☐ Public  ☐ Council  ☐ Manager  ☒ Staff

Requested Council Meeting Date:  01/19/2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request:  Community Planning Services

Name of Presenter(s):  Catherine Garner

Requested Agenda Item:  Z-02-2020 – 725 S. Main Street, Parcel ID 015 537

Description of Requested Agenda Item:  Z-02-2020: Request to rezone one (1) parcel at 725 S. Main Street (PID 015 537) from Highway Business (HB) to Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX).

Attachments:  ☒ Yes  ☐ No

Fiscal Note:  (If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item:  (Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)
Council to consider adopting an ordinance to rezone the subject parcel as requested.

Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Catherine Garner, catherine.garner@salisburync.gov, 704-638-5212

☐ Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)

☒ Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________  _______________________
Finance Manager Signature  Department Head Signature

_________________________________
Budget Manager Signature

****All agenda items must be submitted at least 7 days before the requested Council meeting date****

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only
MEMO

TO: Salisbury City Council

FROM: Catherine Garner

DATE: January 11, 2021

RE: Requested Additional Information for Z-02-2020 (725 S Main Street)

At the January 5, 2021 City Council meeting, additional information was requested about the Highway Business zoning district and the prohibition on the single family dwelling use, as well as a zoning map showing a larger area of the South Main Street corridor.

The zoning districts in the Land Development Ordinance (Chapter 2) are organized on the theory of the transect model, which transitions land uses from rural to urban. T-1, representing the most rural places, corresponds with the Rural Residential (RR) zoning district. T-6 is the most urban places, represented by the Downtown Mixed-Use (DMX) district. Tacked onto the end of the transect are the “Special Districts,” which “make allowance for auto-dependent activities, such as big-box retail, institutional campuses, and industrial zones. These special districts are the Highway Business (HB), Hospital Services (HS), Community and Institution (CI), Light Industrial (LI), Heavy Industrial (HI), and Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND).

The LDO states, or defines, the intensity of commercial development in the Highway Business District is established by the traffic of the fronting thoroughfare. The intent of these regulations is to facilitate convenient access, minimize traffic congestion, and reduce the visual impact of excessive signage and parking lots. This district appears in many places including Jake Alexander Boulevard, South Main Street (beyond the intersection with Jake Alexander Blvd), Faith Road, and Julian Road. Per the definition, and in application, it is intended for areas of auto-oriented, higher intensity uses.

The Use Matrix in LDO Section 2.7.C does not prohibit all residential uses in the HB district. Multi-family dwellings are permitted, which is more appropriate in a higher density setting than individual, single family dwellings, typically intended for one of the residential districts (Rural Residential, General Residential, Historic Residential, Urban Residential) or even one of the lower-medium intensity mixed use districts, such as Residential Mixed-Use (RMX) or Neighborhood Mixed-Use (NMX).

In the Chestnut Hill area of South Main Street, the Highway Business (HB) zoning district application was likely a result of the zoning district conversion when the LDO took effect in 2008. The corridor, generally from Monroe Street to Johnson Street/Chestnut Hill Cemetery, could benefit from further planning study to review the appropriateness of all zoning districts currently in use in the corridor.
SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR

Zoning Map: Monroe Street to Johnson Street

Z-02-2020 subject parcel highlighted in teal
# REZONING PETITION

**FILING DATE**: 11/04/2020  
**CASE #**: 2-02-2020  
**ZONING MAP AMENDMENT**: $600

**PETITION TYPE**

- [ ] General Rezoning (LDO Sec. 15.21)
- [x] Petition involves entire parcel(s) as shown on the Rowan County tax map
- [ ] Petition involves a portion of a parcel(s) as shown on the Rowan County tax map
- [ ] Petitioner is the property owner of record
- [ ] Petitioner is an entity requesting a 3rd-party rezoning
- [ ] City-initiated rezoning

**EXISTING DISTRICT(S):** HB  
**PROPOSED DISTRICT(S):** CMX

**GENERAL PROPERTY DESCRIPTION (ESPECIALLY IF UNADDRESSED)**

LARGE HISTORIC HOUSE FORMERLY USED AS A RESIDENCE

**PROPERTY & CONTACT INFORMATION**

Rowan County Parcel ID(s): 015537  
Address or Site Location: 725 S MAIN ST

Subdivision:  
Lot(s):  
Petitioner: EDWARD CLEMENT  
Address: 310 S ELLIS ST  
Email: edwardmclement@gmail.com  
Best Phone: 704-975-0205

Owner (if different than petitioner):  
Address:  
Email:  
Daytime Phone:

**SIGNATURE**

By signing this petition you understand that this petition will be forwarded to the Planning Board (a City Council-appointed board) who may hear statements from staff, the petitioner, and general public, and will then vote to make a Statement of Consistency and recommendation to City Council. The petition will then be forwarded to City Council who will conduct the official public hearing before casting a deciding vote.

Petitioner (or representative):  

Application Last Revised: MARCH, 2020
### DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

**INITIAL PLANNING BOARD DATE:**  
____/____/20__

- **IF SENT TO LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**
  - **ASSIGNED LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE:**
  - **LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**
    - 
    - 
    - 

- **DATE OF INITIAL COMMITTEE MEETING:**  
  ____/____/20__

- **DATE OF ADDITIONAL MEETINGS:**
  ____/____/20__

- **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION?**

- **PLANNING BOARD STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY & RECOMMENDATION:**
  
  - **DATE OF RECOMMENDATION:**  
    ____/____/20__

  - **VOTE:**
    (_______)

  - **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR FILE:**

---

**INITIAL CITY COUNCIL DATE:**  
____/____/20__

- **IF SENT TO COUNCIL COMMITTEE**
  - **COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

- **DATE OF INITIAL COMMITTEE MEETING:**  
  ____/____/20__

- **DATE OF ADDITIONAL MEETINGS:**
  ____/____/20__

- **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION?**

- **CITY COUNCIL STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY & REASONABLENESS:**

- **DECISION:**
  - **DATE OF DECISION:**  
    ____/____/20__

  - **VOTE:**
    (_______)

  - **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR FILE:**

CASE NO. | Z-02-2020
---|---
Petitioner(s) | Edward & Nancy Clement
Owner(s) | Same
Representative(s) | Same
Address | 725 S. Main Street
Tax Map & Parcel(s) | 015 537
Size / Scope | 0.56 acres encompassing one (1) parcel
Location | Parcel is located on the east side of S Main Street and backs up to the railroad tracks at the rear of the property.

PETITIONER REQUEST

Request: | Petition proposes request to amend the Land Development Ordinance district map by rezoning one (1) parcel approximately 0.56 acres from Highway Business (HB) to Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX).

Staff Comments: | The petitioner is requesting to downzone the parcel from HB to CMX in order to re-establish a residential use in the existing building. This request is not a Conditional District rezoning request; thus, if approved, all development would have to conform to the requirements of the CMX zoning district as adopted.

City Council received a presentation on this text amendment and held a public hearing at the last meeting on January 5, 2021. Staff has not received any comments following the public hearing. Please consider adoption of this ordinance amendment at the January 19, 2021 City Council meeting.

Uses: | All permitted uses in the CMX zoning district would be permitted per the LDO Chapter 2 Use Matrix. This request is not a conditional district zoning request; therefore, all uses will be permitted per the existing Use Matrix.

CHARACTER OF AREA

Overview: | The parcel (Parcel ID 015 537) is currently developed with one structure with associated on-site parking in the rear. Development surrounds the parcel on all sides. The railroad corridor is at the rear of the property, with the Salisbury Cotton Mill across the railroad line. The only access is via an alley from S. Main Street. Existing uses range in the
surrounding vicinity from car dealerships, office space, religious institutional, and residential multi-family.

### Surrounding Land Use(s) & Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Land Uses</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North of area</td>
<td>Residential (single family and multi-family), commercial</td>
<td>HB, HR, UR-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of area</td>
<td>Commercial, Cemetery, Warehousing</td>
<td>DMX, OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of area</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of area</td>
<td>Residential (single family and multi-family), Religious Institution, Commercial</td>
<td>CI, HB, NMX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INFRASTRUCTURE & CIVIC/COMMUNITY FACILITIES

- **Public Schools:**
  - Elementary: Koontz
  - Middle: Knox / Henderson
  - High: Salisbury / Henderson

- **Fire District:**
  - Station 1

- **Utilities**
  - *Water & Sewer:*
    - Public water and sewer are available within the S Main St. right-of-way (ROW). Changes to any existing services would be reviewed and approved during construction document review.

- **Transportation**
  - *Transit:*
    - Route #1 serves this site on S. Main St.

  - *Property Access(s):*
    - Based on GIS, it appears the primary means of ingress & egress is at the back of the parcel via Knox Street across the NC Railroad ROW.

  - *Public Improvements:*
    - S. Main Street (US-29) is a NCDOT maintained road.

### ENVIRONMENT

- **Topography / Hydrology:**
  - The parcel sits above South Main Street. The public sidewalk is also above South Main Street but is connected by four (4) concrete steps. The house sits back from the sidewalk and is
Planning & Zoning Analysis

also accessed by steps from the public sidewalk to the private walkway to the structure. The portion of the parcel the house sits on appears to be flat, but the parcel rises overall from north to south.

The site is not encumbered by any streams, flood hazards, or wetlands as identified on the City’s GIS maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Hazard / Streams / Wetlands:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is not encumbered by any streams, flood hazards, or wetlands as identified on the City’s GIS maps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPREHENSIVE &amp; AREA PLANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Plans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Statements:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision Statements:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historic Preservation

We see the entire community, from school-aged children to senior citizens, with a keen appreciation for Salisbury’s rich history. There is constant attention and energy being poured into the preservation and rehabilitation of the city’s historic buildings and other natural resources. We see Salisbury as a model for the state and nation, drawing visitors from far and wide to experience a living, growing community immersed in an historic setting.

Housing

We see a multitude of housing choices, ranging from single-family homes, to townhouses, to garage apartments to apartments over downtown shops or the neighborhood corner store. We see neighborhoods with several different well-designed housing types for all incomes where the elderly, young families, singles, and others share experiences and help one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING BOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This proposal was presented to Planning Board at their courtesy hearing on December 8, 2020. The Planning Board heard from Edward Clement and Nancy Clement as applicants. Greg Rapp also spoke on behalf of the applicants. No one attended to speak regarding the application. After deliberation, the Planning Board unanimously of members present to recommend approval, stating the proposal is consistent with Vision 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Z-02-2020: 725 S Main Street; PID 015 537
Edward Clement – owner/applicant

Request
- Rezone one (1) parcel from Highway Business (HB) to Corridor Mixed Use (CMX)
- Site is currently developed with one building
  - House building type
  - Most recently utilized as commercial space
### Use Matrix

| BASE DISTRICT | O & P | R & T | G & R | U & R | H & R | R & M | N & M | C & M | T & M | D & M | H & B | L & I | H & S | C & T | M & H | T & N |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Residential   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| High Density   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Low Density    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Independent    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Assisted       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Nursing Home   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Home Health    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Home Care      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Hospice Care   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Medical Clinic |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

### Office / Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Boarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Use Matrix for the residential and office services. The matrix shows the distribution of residential and office services across different districts. Each district is represented by a matrix cell indicating the presence (P) or absence (F) of specific services.
Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASE DISTRICT</th>
<th>OSP</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>UR</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>BMX</th>
<th>NMX</th>
<th>CMX</th>
<th>BMX</th>
<th>HB</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>MHD</th>
<th>TND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office / Service (con.)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Offices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Organizations</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Retail</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASE DISTRICT</th>
<th>OSP</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>UR</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>BMX</th>
<th>NMX</th>
<th>CMX</th>
<th>BMX</th>
<th>HB</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>MHD</th>
<th>TND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Manufacturing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Devices</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Processing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASE DISTRICT</th>
<th>OSP</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>UR</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>BMX</th>
<th>NMX</th>
<th>CMX</th>
<th>BMX</th>
<th>HB</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>MHD</th>
<th>TND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machining</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Fabrication</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Processing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use Matrix
Applicable Vision Statements

• **Historic Preservation:** We see the entire community, from school-aged children to senior citizens, with a keen appreciation for Salisbury’s rich history. There is constant attention and energy being poured into the preservation and rehabilitation of the city’s historic buildings and other natural resources. We see Salisbury as a model for the state and nation, drawing visitors from far and wide to experience a living, growing community immersed in an historic setting.

Applicable Vision Statements

• **Housing:** We see a multitude of housing choices, ranging from single-family homes, to townhomes, to garage apartments to apartments over downtown shops or the neighborhood corner store. We see neighborhoods with several different well-designed housing types for all incomes where the elderly, young families, singles, and others share experiences and help one another.
Salisbury City Council
Statement of Consistency & Zoning Recommendation

DISTRICT MAP AMENDMENT: Z-02-2020
Project Title: Z-02-2020
Petitioner(s): Edward Clement
Owner(s): Edward Clement
Representative(s) or Developer(s): N/A
Tax Map - Parcel(s): 015 537
Size / Scope: Approximately 0.56 acres encompassing one (1) parcel
Location: 725 S Main Street

REQUEST:

Request to amend the Land Development District Map by rezoning one (1) parcel at 0 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave. PID 015 537 from ‘HIGHWAY BUSINESS (HB)’ to ‘CORRIDOR MIXED USE (CMX)’

STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY & RECOMMENDATION:

The Salisbury City Council held a public hearing and reviewed the petition on January 5, 2021. The Council finds that the rezoning petition of the aforementioned parcels are NOT INCONSISTENT with the Salisbury Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan, is reasonable, and in the public interest because:

This specific rezoning action is not inconsistent of the comprehensive plan nor violates the goals, objectives, or policies of the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT MAP OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, REZONING 0.56 ACRES OF 725 S MAIN STREET (PARCEL ID 015 537) FROM HIGHWAY BUSINESS (HB) TO CORRIDOR MIXED USE (CMX). (PETITION NO. Z-02-2020)

WHEREAS, a petition to rezone the properties described herein was properly filed by the City of Salisbury; and

WHEREAS, the Salisbury Planning Board, an advisory board to the Salisbury City Council, reviewed the rezoning petition on December 8, 2020, unanimously voted to recommend approval as submitted, and stated that the request is consistent with the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a properly-noticed public hearing at the regularly-scheduled City Council meeting of January 5, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby finds and determines that adoption of an Ordinance to rezone the properties described herein, as requested, are NOT INCONSISTENT with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan due to the proposed petition, site characteristics, surrounding development pattern, and observations provided by city planning staff, identifying there are no policies in direct opposition to the petition.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Salisbury, North Carolina:

SECTION 1. That properties identified in the City of Salisbury and Rowan County as Tax Map 015 Parcel(s) 537 including those abutting rights-of-way and reaching to the respective centerlines, as designated on the official property identification maps of Rowan County, is hereby rezoned to ‘CMX’ district.

SECTION 2. That all Ordinances, or parts of Ordinances, in conflict with this Ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict;

SECTION 3. That this Ordinance shall be effective from and after its passage.
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Please Select Submission Category:  ☐ Public  ☐ Council  ☐ Manager  ☒ Staff

Requested Council Meeting Date:  January 19, 2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request:  Community Planning Services & Engineering

Name of Presenter(s):  Alyssa Nelson, Urban Design Planner; Hannah Jacobson, Community Planning Director; Wendy Brindle, Engineering Director

Requested Agenda Item:  Downtown Main Street Plan – Public Input

Description of Requested Agenda Item:

This public is invited to provide feedback on the proposed Main Street Plan at the upcoming presentations:

Virtually on:

- Thursday, January 21, at the Neighborhood Leaders Alliance meeting (4 p.m.),
- Wednesday, January 27, Main Street Plan Zoom meeting (6 p.m.),

Or outdoors and in person on:

- Friday, January 22, in front of Koco Java (8 a.m.)
- or Friday January 22 in front of the Wells Fargo building near Sidewalk Deli. (11:30 a.m.)

For meeting links and to view the draft plans, visit:  www.salisburync.gov/mainstplan. Free Zoom accounts are needed to participate in the virtual meetings.

Attachments:  ☐ Yes  ☒ No

Fiscal Note: (If fiscal note requires approval by finance department because item exceeds $100,000 or is related to grant funds, please fill out signature blocks for finance at bottom of form and provide supporting documents)

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item:  (Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)

Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Alyssa Nelson, 704.638.5235, anels@salisburync.gov

☐ Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)

☒ Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

________________________________________
Finance Manager Signature

________________________________________
Department Head Signature

________________________________________
Budget Manager Signature

****All agenda items must be submitted at least 7 days before the requested Council meeting date***

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved ☐ Delayed ☐ Declined

Reason: