



**Minutes
February 10, 2022**

The City of Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission met in a regular session at 5:15 p.m. on Thursday, February 10, 2022, at 217 South Main Street in the Council Chamber.

Present: Steve Cobb, Eugene Goetz, Will James, Sue McHugh, Marcelo Menza, Jon Planovsky, Andrew Walker, Acey Worthy

Absent: Larry Richardson

Staff Present: Graham Corriher, Hannah Jacobson, Emily Vanek

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, Andrew Walker. Members introduced themselves.

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURE

The purpose and procedure of the meeting was presented by Chairperson, Andrew Walker.

**EX PARTE COMMUNICATION/
CONFLICT OF INTEREST OR APPEARANCE OF CONFLICT**

Steve Cobb recused himself from H-64-2021 due to ex parte communication. Gene Goetz recused from the Landmark application, as he is the applicant.

Emily Vanek was sworn in.

NEW CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

H-64-2021, 115 South Jackson Street; Dyke Messenger, Applicant; Bill Burgin, Agent; Bell Tower Green, LLC, Owner; (Parcel ID: 010 153)

Request

Demolition of stone accessory building, rear addition, elevator installation, donor wall, and fencing.

Identification of Property

Emily Vanek made a staff presentation. The house is a Federal style, built c. 1838-1839. It is classified as “pivotal” to the West Square Local Historic District. She displayed the history of Certificates of Appropriateness for the property.

Staff Findings

Staff finds the following elements of the project to be partially incongruous with the character of the West Square Local Historic District:

Demolition

- 1) The applicant has requested approval demolish the stone accessory structure behind the main building. The building was constructed in the 1980’s. The stone will be recovered and reused elsewhere on the building. HPC may institute a demolition delay of up to 365 days. The demolition should follow Standards 6.5.1 and 6.5.2.

Elevator

- 2) The applicant has proposed to install an elevator on the southern elevation of the building. The exterior of the elevator is proposed to be finished with brick veneer and roof parapet to match the existing building. This is similar to the materials on the rest of the building and appropriate according to Standard 5.3.1. The elevator is proposed to be attached to the oldest part of the structure. The elevator will remove two windows from the building. Standard 5.4.1 states that additions should be located as inconspicuously as possible and Standard 5.4.2 states that additions should be built so that there is the least possible loss of historic fabric.

Dining Addition

- 3) The applicant has proposed an expansion to the dining area, into the existing deck and patio. The exterior wall will be nearly flush with the existing building. The addition will be finished with a curtain wall, clapboard siding, and salvaged stone on the foundation. These materials meet Standard 5.3.1.
- 4) The addition would not be visible from the front of the building, but would be highly visible from the walkway and portions of the park. A glass enclosure, approved for removal in 2019, was once located in the same spot and approved by HPC for removal. A dining area addition similar to the one proposed was approved by HPC in 2020.

Second Floor Addition

- 5) Above the proposed dining addition, a second floor addition has been proposed. The addition will be finished with a curtain wall, clapboard siding, and have an exterior walkway with a metal guardrail. The roof above will be standing seam metal, the same as on the rest of the building. These materials meet Standard 5.3.1.

Kitchen Addition

- 6) An addition on the rear portion of the building is also being proposed by the applicant. The location of the addition is appropriate according to Standard 5.4.1. The addition will be finished with brick veneer, clapboard siding, and stone for the foundation. These materials meet Standards 5.3.1. Parapet endwalls will be added to either side of the addition to match the Wrenn House.
- 7) A window to service the park is proposed on the north elevation of the addition. A metal awning is proposed above the window. Standard 4.7.14 states that metal awnings can be used in instances where they are compatible with the historic character of the building. The metal awning was selected to match the roofing.
- 8) Two windows are proposed on the eastern elevation of the addition. These windows are 9/9 sash, wooden windows and match the windows along the first floor of the rest of the building. These windows are appropriate according to Standard 5.3.1.

Rear Deck

- 9) The rear deck has been proposed to be rearranged to an accessibility ramp and stairs. Standard 3.8.2 states that health and safety codes should be met in ways that do not diminish the historic character of the building. Standard 5.5.9 states that it is not appropriate to use unfinished lumber as a finished appearance for decks.

Patio

- 10) The patio on the northern yard of the property is proposed to be finished with brick pavers, similar to those found in the park. Standard 4.2.10 states that brick is an appropriate material for walkways and paths throughout the district. The patio will be surrounded by a metal fence. The material and design of the fence meet Standard 4.4.4. Painted poles will be located within the patio to hold up festoon lights. These lights are similar to those found in the park and are appropriate according to Standard 4.3.2.

Donor Wall

- 11) A donor wall, constructed of stone, is proposed near the eastern edge of the property. The material meets Standard 5.3.1.

Fencing and Enclosures

- 12) Wooden fencing and gates are proposed to conceal mechanical units on the northern elevation of the building and garbage bins between the kitchen addition and donor wall. The fencing and gates meet Standard 4.4.4, but should be stained a natural wood color.

Staff Recommendations

Based on the preceding findings, staff recommends that the Commission approve H-64-2021 at the Wrenn House located at 115 South Jackson Street, within the West Square Local Historic District (Parcel ID: 010 153) subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The proposed elevator shall be moved to decrease the loss of historic fabric of the building and brought back to the Commission for approval;
- 2) All wooden features shall be stained an appropriate natural wood color;
- 3) The applicant shall receive, prior to commencement of the work, all other required permits or permissions from governmental agencies;
- 4) Commission staff shall review and approve any revisions or deviations to any other portion of the as-submitted work that qualifies as a Minor Work, prior to commencement of that portion of the project.

Applicant Testimony

Bill Burgin was sworn in.

Mr. Burgin explained that there were no issues with Staff recommendations #2, 3, and 4. Changes were designed to make the restaurant functional. Staff recommendation #1 is difficult – location of the elevator has been taken seriously, and every option has been considered. The ADA will most likely require an elevator, so they want it to be 75-80 square feet, to have the smallest footprint possible.

Elevator location – Aside from the proposed location, two other options were considered. Placing the elevator outside, in the corner of the U-shaped deck near the front door, was approved during a previous HPC meeting. The second places the elevator inside, near the front door.

Since the latest restaurant operator has moved the entrance to the front, he is apprehensive to use the plan to place it inside. He feels it would crowd the entrance and cause congestion.

Installing the elevator on the deck would take space away from what the operator calls “money seats.” Those are the highly desirable seats located on the deck. With both options, Mr. Burgin fears that the elevator would come close, or even breach the roof.

Materials – Brick is being used for the elevator structure because it is not associated with a specific period of architecture. It’s durable, and will be attractive for decades. They investigated other materials, such as glass, but felt a simple elevator shaft was best.

Responses to Questions from Commissioners:

If the elevator is located inside, it would be the same size, however, 80 square feet would be a high percentage relative to the inside space. It would also need to extend at or past the roof. Elevators are highly regulated for safety, so design options are limited.

Mr. Burgin would be glad to show the Commission prior plans using alternatives to the outside elevator structure. It is possible to install windows in the brick structure.

In building the elevator shaft, they are not trying to match the original brick, in an effort to show a clear distinction of time periods.

There are no plans for access to the elevator from outside.

The least intrusive choice was the option that places the elevator inside. Mr. Burgin likes that better than the original outside option, which takes space away from “money seats.”

The reason Staff declared the proposal partially incongruous is due to the loss of historic materials and location of the elevator on the oldest portion of the building. Mr. Burgin can make arrangements to save pieces that would be lost, i.e., windows. Windows can be salvaged for this use, and can be added to the elevator shaft to provide a more symmetrical façade. In response to why they didn’t locate the elevator on the opposite side, Mr. Burgin explained that moving it would place it in an area that would segregate people with disabilities from able-bodied people. He wanted to make sure that didn’t happen.

According to design standards, an addition should be designed to provide for its possible removal. Mr. Burgin said the elevator shaft could be removed if necessary, with some repair done after the fact.

According to the plans, the poles used on the patio for festoon lighting will be made of metal.

The 2nd floor patio addition will be covered with clear canvas that can be rolled up and down to allow for use during any type of weather.

Regarding the demolition of the stone building, Mr. Burgin explained that it was built in the 1980’s, and needs to be replaced because it cannot connect to the kitchen; the floors in each building have different elevations. The new addition will have a floor at the same elevation as the kitchen and will be in the same place and size as the original. The stone will find new life in the addition and donor wall.

The intent of the back building is storage and sales of food and beverages to customers walking up from the Bell Tower Green Park. Windows can be added opposite the serving window to follow standards of rhythm.

The awning on the serving window gives protection to customers from the elements and from leaks.

Public Comment

Kimberly Stieg, Executive Director of the Historic Salisbury Foundation was sworn in. She spoke on behalf of the Foundation’s opposition to the applicant adding an elevator shaft to the exterior of the structure. In addition to the unappealing aesthetics of the brick tower, she reminded the Commission that the proposal violates the 2 standards mentioned in the Staff Report: Standard

5.4.1 states that additions should be located as inconspicuously as possible and Standard 5.4.2 states that additions should be built so that there is the least possible loss of historic fabric.

To illustrate these violations, Ms. Stiek said the proposed location on the southwest end of the original building is most visible to park visitors and vehicle traffic. Also, the proposed tower will result in the removal of two original windows, destruction of a large portion of the original Flemish bond brickwork, and obscuring the distinctive stepped parapet.

Referring to the alternative options mentioned during Applicant Testimony, the Historic Salisbury Foundation prefers the interior installation. That area has already seen damage, and it would be in an unobtrusive location. They appreciate the desire of the Applicant to make the building suitable for use as a restaurant, but believe it shouldn't be at the expense of the historic integrity of the Wrenn House. She asked the Commission to deny the request for that portion of the proposal.

Clyde was sworn in. Clyde spoke in opposition of all additions to the Wrenn House. He believes the new additions will overpower the original building as well as its historical significance.

Deliberation

Regarding concerns outside of the elevator: The members decided they could suggest the addition of windows to the addition, as mentioned in Standards 5.4.5 and 5.3.7 that address the spacing of windows. The Commission can delay, but cannot stop, a demolition.

Elevator: The Commission is concerned with Standards, as opposed to opinion, although they understand the difficulty and thoughtfulness involved with the placement of the elevator.

Discussion centered on this concern, with the focus being on the 5.4 section of the guidelines, as well as the Secretary of Interior standards. They asked Mr. Burgin if it was possible to move the elevator further back to the middle joining section. He said it was possible, but the elevator would most likely emerge through the roof. The suggestion of adding windows to the elevator was discussed, with the realization that it would still violate the guidelines. Members also made note that HPC has already approved a plan to install the elevator in the corner of the upstairs patio.

Findings of Fact

Sue McHugh made the following MOTION, "I have reviewed the case and all presented testimony and facts and am familiar with the property in question and, therefore, move that the Commission find the following facts concerning HPC case #H-64-2021

1. That **Bill Burgin agent for Bell Tower Green, Inc.,** appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property located at **115 South Jackson Street** and designated within the **West Square** Local Historic District.
2. The proposed project is **partially incongruous** as detailed in the application and staff finding numbers 1 & 2 and incorporated herein; further evidence and testimony was provided by Kimberly Stieg, who disapproves of changes to the building on behalf of the Historic Salisbury Foundation that it is, per our guidelines 5.4.1 and 5.4.2, conspicuously located and causes loss of the historic character of the building. Clyde also spoke and said

the elevator addition overpowers the historic building and that the dry storage addition does not align with the rest of the building.

3. The findings are subject to the 4 conditions recommended by staff and incorporated herein. The additional condition to be applied is that on the new dry storage addition, per guidelines 5.4.5 and 5.3.7, there should be windows added that are compatible to the design of the rest of the building.”

Acey Worthy seconded the MOTION with all members present VOTING AYE. (7-0)

Roll Call: Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Marcelo Menza (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), Acey Worthy (AYE).

Action

Sue McHugh continued, “I, therefore, move based on the testimony presented, the adopted Findings of Fact and the adopted Historic District Design Standards that the Commission: **Approve** H-64-2021 subject to the conditions detailed in the Findings of Fact. **Deny** H-64-2021 based on the following: the location of the elevator per Design Standards 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3 and the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 9 and 10.”

Acey Worthy seconded the MOTION with all members present VOTING AYE (7-0)

Roll Call: Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Marcelo Menza (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), Acey Worthy (AYE).

Sue McHugh moved to recuse Gene Goetz from the Landmark application and to bring Steve Cobb back to the dais.

H-01-2022, 322 South Main Street, Holmes Investment Company, Jeff Moore, Owner/Applicant; (Parcel ID: 101 608 0001) - Withdrawn

HISTORIC LANDMARK APPLICATIONS

HL-01-2022, 126 East Steele Street; Christine and Eugene Goetz, Owners/Applicants

Request

Review of Local Historic Landmark – Property (LHL-P) application.

Identification of Property

Emily Vanek made a staff presentation. The Mary Steele Scales House (aka Scales-Grubb House) is a Queen Anne/Late Victoria style, built 1893. It is classified as “Pivotal” to the North Main Street Local Historic District and North Main Street National Register Historic District.

Staff Findings

Applicable Sections of Criteria for Local Historic Landmark – Property (LHL-P)

The following definitions of special significance and integrity, as established by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, shall be utilized when evaluating properties for both types of Local Historic Landmark Overlays.

- a. Special significance
 - Criterion A: Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
 - Criterion B: Association with the lives of significant persons in our past.
 - Criterion C: 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 D: Yield or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.
- b. Integrity
 - Location: Where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
 - Design: The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
 - Setting: The physical environment of a historic property.
 - Workmanship: The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
 - Materials: The physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
 - Feeling: The property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
 - Association: The direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

Criteria to Designate as a Local Historic Landmark – Property (LHL-P)

1. The proposed property must be found to have special significance for its historical, prehistorical, architectural, or cultural importance in at least one of the special significance criterion, as defined in this section.
2. The proposed property must be found to have integrity in all seven (7) aspects as defined in this section.

Staff Findings - Report Summary

1. Special Significance

- Criteria C

The Mary Steele Scales house most closely aligns with Criterion C because it embodies the distinctive characteristics of an early mail-order residential design catalog produced by George Barber. While others were also involved in the mail-

order architecture business at the time, the George F. Barber and Company refined the customization process for customers by adding a detailed form on the back. The Mary Steele Scales house was built utilizing George Barber's Design #12 from the residential design catalog, Cottage Souvenir #2. When comparing the house to the catalog plan, several differences exist between the Mary Steele Scales house and Design #12 (further discussed under Integrity); however, it is undocumented if these modifications were the result of the customization process Barber was known for. The Mary Steele Scales house was one of four known Barber designs in Salisbury, three of which remain.

- Criteria B

The landmark designation report suggests that the Mary Steele Scales house is of local significance from its association with Mary Steele Scales and Major Nathaniel Scales. When determining if a property has special significance under Criteria B, it is important to first determine the importance of the individual and second to ascertain the length and nature of their association with the property. The report affirms Mary Steele Scales as a belle of Western Carolina and a local patriot, but does not further describe her specific contribution to Salisbury's history. Her husband, Nathaniel Scales, was a Lieutenant then Major in the Civil War and worked on the East Tennessee and Western North Carolina Railroad, but these events do not portray any historic significance to Salisbury in particular. The house was constructed in 1893 and was the home of Mary Steele Scales and Nathaniel Scales until 1917. No information about their lives or work was provided for the period 1893 to 1917.

2. Integrity

- Location

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred. The Mary Steele Scales House was the third house built on the Steeleworth Plantation, and remains on the same corner of East Steele Street and Scales Street. For undocumented reasons, the house was rotated from facing Scales Street to its current frontage on East Steele Street sometime between 1910 and 1912. Typically, the relationship between a property and its historic association is destroyed if a property is moved.

- Design

Design is the combination of elements that create the historic form, plan, space, structure and style of the property. This includes the structural system, massing, arrangement of spaces, fenestration patterns, textures, colors, and ornamental detailing. Barber's Design #12 is an example of a Queen Anne style home. The Mary Steele Scales house is missing ornamental details on its roof, siding, and porch commonly found on Queen Anne style homes and that were included in the catalog's

design. While it appears to be a simplified version of Design #12. The roof lines, fenestration patterns, massing, size, and scale of the house match the design.

Barber was known for introducing a customization process, but it is unknown if the differences observed (listed below) between the house and the Catalog design are the result of that process.

Comparing the roofs of the two, several ornamental details, including finials, decorated verge boards, and a truss in the front gable, are not present on the house. Decorative siding from the top gable and decorative wainscoted belts are included in Design #12, but are not found on the house. It is unclear if these features were removed, or were not included during construction. The porch wraps the front and to the right around the house, but only a front veranda exists in Design #12. The layout of the interior of the house has been altered from the design as well, including an additional bathroom on the second floor, a utility room on the first floor, and access from the parlor to the living room with the deletion of a built in bookcase.

- Setting

Setting refers to the character of the place in which the property played its historical role. It involves how, not just where, the property is situated and its historical relationship to surrounding features and open space. The original siting of the Mary Steele Scales house was within the Steeleworth Plantation. Lombardy, located at 1010 Richard Street, about two blocks away from the Mary Steele Scales house, was the main building on the plantation. Today, the Mary Steele Scales house sits on a comparatively larger half-acre corner lot within a neighborhood context.

- Workmanship

Workmanship is the evidence of an artisan's labor or skills. The detailing of the trims and pediments of the door and windows, porch brackets, and spindlework are typical of Victorian styled homes and are well preserved, but these details appear to be modifications from Design #12.

- Materials

The choice of materials in a historic property demonstrates the preference and availability of materials of the time. The Mary Steele Scales house retains its original wooden windows, wooden, clapboard siding, and wooden porch columns, balustrade, and decorative elements. The roof is currently covered with asphalt shingles. This material was not used until the 1900's and was not the original roofing material. The interior has been modernized, but the changes do not affect the materiality of remaining original features.

- Feeling

Feeling is related to the property's ability to evoke a particular period in history. Feeling results from the presence of physical features that convey a property's

historic character. Therefore, if a property is found to have integrity of materials, design, location, and setting, it is more likely able to express its historic character.

- Association

Association is based on the property's ability to convey a direct link to a historical event or person. A property retains integrity of association if it *is* the place where a historic event occurred.

Staff Findings - Proposed Designation and Boundaries

The landmark application report proposes the exterior of the house, garage, and picket fence to be designated. The gazebo, which was added in the 1980's, is not proposed to be included in the landmark designation. Staff recommends that the picket fence also be excluded from the designation since it was constructed in 1984 and has no association with George Barber. Since the property is within the North Main Street Local Historic District, the exterior of all buildings and site features will still be subject to the Certificate of Appropriateness process and the Local Historic Design Standards, regardless of landmark designation.

The report proposes the entirety of the interior to be designated. Within the interior architectural description, several features, including the oak flooring, kitchen island, kitchen cabinets with stained glass doors, and wainscoting, were described to have been added in the 1986 remodel. Other features, including the staircase, including millwork, balustrade, and newel posts, porcelain doorknobs, built-in shelving in the living room are listed as original features or are documented in the Design #12 plans. Staff recommends that only those features documented as original to the house be included in the landmark designation.

Pre-Application Decision

At the August 8th, 2019 HPC Meeting, the Commission determined that the building is likely to have special significance and integrity warranting designation as a Local Historic Landmark as described in Chapter 15 of the Land Development Ordinance (LDO).

State Historic Preservation Office Comment

The report was submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for their review and comment period, as required by NCGS 160D-946. SHPO does not make a recommendation on the approval of a landmark, but provides advice on if there is sufficient information to determine if there is enough information provided to make a decision on a landmark application. On December 3, 2021, SHPO's response was received and provided to the applicant. SHPO recommended minor layout changes, the usage of National Register diction, and clear designations for the interior and picket fence, if they were to be included.

HPC: Action on the Local Historic Landmark Application

The HPC shall make a recommendation to City Council whether the property has been found to exhibit special significance and integrity worthy of Local Historic Landmark designation.

Applicant Testimony

Gene Goetz was sworn in.

Mr. Goetz and his wife, Christine, have done extensive research regarding the history of the house and its surroundings. They agree with Staff that due to recent changes, the kitchen should be excluded from the application. They also feel that the architecture of the house provides a stronger argument for the designation than the family history.

Mr. Goetz explained that the house is an example of George Barber's Design #12, one of a very few still located in the US and Canada. Staff has found another example in Tennessee, as well as a more appropriate one in Canada. Barber was known to encourage buyers of his designs to alter them to their liking in an effort to make them happy. Although Barber houses are spread thinly throughout the country, it is quite remarkable that Salisbury is home to three of them.

Mr. Goetz addressed Staff comments directly. Barber houses were simplified by design, and very few #12 houses were built. This house has a bathroom on the second floor, which was a suggestion made by Barber himself. Regarding the rotation of the house on its lot, Mr. Goetz believes that is not an issue because the house remains on the lot it was originally built, although rotated to face a different direction. He believes that his house retains its setting and is not dependent on the original plantation house for that designation. When recently replacing the roof, he noticed asphalt shingles underneath, which provides evidence that the house has had a shingle roof since construction.

In the process of researching the history of the Steele-Scales family, they were able to find that Christine Goetz shares ancestors with the family. They've provided Historic Salisbury Foundation and the Rowan County Public Library with the family research.

Deliberation

The Commission members discussed the examples shown and agreed that the Ontario example needs to be updated. The case for Criteria C is stronger, and members suggested it be emphasized when brought before City Council, as well as the number of #12 designs built, and why this one is special. This case needs to be argued well, because it is the first presentation for a Landmark since City Council set new criteria.

Parameters for Integrity have been met. Special Significance (Criteria C) argument is strong, but Mr. Goetz will need to demonstrate the uniqueness of the house, as City Council will have questions regarding that section.

Members were informed that Historic Salisbury Foundation has covenants on the property.

Sue McHugh moved to reinstate Gene Goetz to the dais.

OTHER BUSINESSMinor Works Report

The Minor Works Report was received.

Approval of Minutes

Sue McHugh moved to approve the December 2021 minutes as written. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Hearing – Local Historic Design Standards Update

The update is posted online here: [Proposed Local Historic Design Standards](#)

Ms. Vanek presented the changes the Commission had suggested in the December meeting. The next steps are as follows:

1. State Historic Preservation Office Review – Ms. Vanek has sent the updates, but received no response yet. She will contact the office again.
2. Formatting updated standards document
3. City Council for public hearing and approval


2021 Highlights and 2022 Goals

Ms. Vanek presented the highlights of the past year and goals to the Commission.


2021 Case Work

Review Type	Number of Cases	
Minor Works (approved by staff)	136	
Major Works	Approved	42
	Approved w/ conditions	18
	Denied	6
Local Historic Landmarks	2	
Local Historic Landmark Pre-Applications (active)	1	

Local Historic Landmarks



Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House
619 South Main Street



Beulah Stewart Moore House
124 South Ellis Street

Historic Preservation Incentive Grants: \$20,000 awarded		Paul Bruhn Historic Revitalization Grants: \$500,000 awarded		
Total Projects Awarded:	12	Project	Address	Awarded
Brooklyn-South Square	1	Glenn Manse	212 West Liberty Street	\$36,250
Ellis Street Graded School	2	Bell Block	133 South Main Street	\$150,000
North Main Street	3	Holmes Building	121 West Innes Street	\$28,091
West Square	6	Wrenn House	115 South Jackson Street	\$93,750
		Salisbury Building	121 West Council Street	\$150,000

2022 Goals

HPC will:	
Promote Historic Districts and Local Landmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Historic Preservation Incentive Grant Program - \$30,000 <u>funding request, expand to rental housing</u>• Partner with groups (HSF, DSI, RoCo) on initiatives that support historic neighborhoods and downtown, <u>letters to new owners, brochures</u>• <u>Social media</u> and other education initiatives• <u>New street signs</u>• <u>Update Salisbury Historic District</u>
Improve Procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• More training opportunities (with SHPO)• Update Local Historic Design Standards

HPC Social Media Discussion

Ms. Vanek broached the subject of a social media presence for the HPC. The Members agreed that it would be important for public relations and HPC's image. Staff will begin the approval process with the City's Communications Department.

Other Business

The Commission discussed the pink granite building that was demolished to make space for Bankett Station. The HPC meeting containing this case reflected no timeframe for the developer to rebuild the property as decided by the Commission. Mr. Cobb reported that Historic Salisbury Foundation has made it a priority, and the developer is of the understanding that it will be done when an appropriate contractor is found. The general consensus is that there is no concrete agreement. Staff will forward the minutes reflecting this decision to the Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Andrew Walker, Chair

Jennifer Pfaff, Secretary