

# HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

## Minutes February 13, 2020

The City of Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission met in regular session at 5:15 p.m. Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 217 S. Main Street in the Council Chamber.

**Present:** Steven Cobb, Sue McHugh, Jon Planovsky, Elizabeth Trick, Andrew Walker and Acey Worthy

**Absent:** Eugene Goetz, Will James, and Larry Richardson

**Staff Present:** Catherine Garner and Diana Cummings

**Media:** Liz Moomey, *Salisbury Post*

### CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

### PURPOSE AND PROCEDURE

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

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

Jon Planovsky will recuse himself for HL-02-2019 because it is his property.

### NEW CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

**H-02-2020, 803 N. Main Street–Salisbury Community Development Center (CDC) (owner/applicant); Michael Kepley (agent)**

Catherine Garner and Michael Kepley were sworn in for testimony.

### Request

Demolition of sunroom addition on rear of structure; installation of concrete patio on rear of structure, closing openings (2) on rear of structure after sunroom removed; installation of rear door; cut and remove tree on left side of structure; exterior lighting installation; removing cellar windows (2) and closing openings; crickets behind columns that are on the roof.

### Identification of Property

Catherine Garner made a staff presentation with photos. The property is located in the North Main Street Local Historic District. The Spanish Mission style C. K. Howan House was built circa 1912 and listed as pivotal.

**Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation Standard #9:** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

*Demolition of sunroom addition on rear of structure; closing openings (2) on rear of structure after sunroom removed; installation of rear door.*

The house features a non-contributing rear sunroom addition. No permits were in the address file to indicate the date that the sunroom was added. The applicant is proposing to remove the sunroom and rework the rear wall to function as a rear exterior elevation wall again. This involves the addition of a rear 36" door. The door proposed is a six-light wood Craftsman style door. The other opening(s) would be closed up and stuccoed to match the existing wall. The placement of original windows on the rear is unknown.

*Installation of concrete patio on rear of structure*

The applicant is proposing to add a 12 ft. by 16 ft. concrete patio at the rear of the structure. The patio would be located in part of the area previously covered by the sunroom and will connect to existing steps to the far rear portion of the property. The patio is proposed to be poured to be below the threshold of the rear entry door as proposed. It will not extend beyond the rear corner of the house into either side yard, reducing visibility from the street.

*Cut and remove tree on left side of structure*

There is a tree at the back rear corner of the house on the left side. According to the arborist's report, the tree appears to be healthy despite some bad structural problems and its close proximity to the house. The applicant believes tree roots are affecting the structure.

*Exterior Lighting*

The applicant is proposing a suite of light fixtures on both the front and rear of the structure. Underneath the front porch, the applicant has proposed a pendant lantern light with textured glass to be centered on the front door. The applicant has also proposed can lighting on the front porch as well. These lights are indiscriminate and will only illuminate the portion of the porch they shine upon. The style of the pendant is appropriate for the Spanish Mission style structure.

The applicant is also proposing two bronze wall sconces to be located on either side of the rear door, as well as a motion sensor on the rear corner for safety over the driveway. These lights are also positioned such that they will have minimal impact on surrounding properties and will be focused on a particular area of the site. These fixtures are also appropriate for the structure and will have minimal visibility from the street.

*Crickets behind columns*

The applicant has also determined that several of the Spanish Mission style elements have caused water damage to the structure and is seeking to mitigate water's impact by redesigning the roof slightly. The areas affected are behind the front pediment on the upper roof and behind the top most portion of the columns on the porch roof. The cricket would help redirect water out from behind the protruding features to divert the water rather than let it dam up behind the feature.

Mr. Kepley did some investigative demolition and believed the addition was a bad design and poor workmanship. The exterior material did not match anything. He found the profile of the soffit was intact, however, rafters were placed on the roof of the original structure.

He will not change the pitch of the roof. (Using bronze TPO material to make it less visible.)

The cellar windows do not appear to be original to the house. When one of the windows was cut, they had to modify the sill at a load-bearing floor girder. Only a portion was used as a cellar. The openings will be blocked back up and re-stuccoed. The grade around the structure will be fixed.

Mr. Kepley assumes that many of the modifications to the house were made when the sunroom was added. There was not a lot of destruction of original material.

There were about 11 original windows; many have been replaced with vinyl windows.

Public Comment

No one spoke in favor or opposition to the request.

Deliberation

Steve Cobb said that he did not have any problem removing the sunroom. He would like to see some investigation to put back the openings that were there originally—especially if there was a window at the master bedroom. Elizabeth Trick said they could come back after the demolition with the opening considerations. It is a large façade for one 36” door.

The concrete patio, cellar windows and lighting is pretty straight forward. The crickets need to be fixed and will not be seen from the street.

The tree is still healthy. Water has a tendency to flow toward the house because of the tree. The property needs to be correctly graded. After the tree is removed, there should be a replanting in an appropriate place.

Demolition can happen without delay. Table the rear openings for after the demolition (board the openings) so the Commission can receive more information about restoration and materials to meet the guidelines. “We don’t have enough facts,” Sue said.

Finding of Facts

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-02-2020:

1. That Michael Kepley, applicant/agent for Salisbury Community Development Corporation, owner, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness
2. For the property located at 803 N. Main Street and designated within the North Main Street Local Historic District.
3. The applicant appeared before the Commission and described the project as follows: “Demolition of sunroom addition on rear of structure; installation of concrete patio on rear of structure, closing openings (2) on rear of structure after sunroom removed; installation of rear door; cut and remove tree on left side of structure; exterior lighting install; removing cellar windows (2) and closing openings; add crickets behind the porch columns.”
4. That the following Historic District Design Guidelines were considered for this application, specifically: Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation: Standards 9; Chapter 3.2 – Exterior Walls, Trim, and Foundations: Guidelines 3.2.2, 3.2.7; Chapter 3.3 – Windows and Doors: Guidelines 3.3.3, 3.3.10; Chapter 3.4 – Roof Form: Guideline 3.4.1; Chapter 4.3 – Lighting: Guidelines 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4; Chapter 4.5 – Landscaping: Guidelines 4.5.1, 4.5.2; Chapter 5.5 – Rear Decks, Terraces, and Rooftop Decks: Guidelines 5.5.1, 5.5.2, 5.5.4, 5.5.6, 5.5.7, 5.5.8.
5. That no one appeared before the Commission to present further testimony or evidence related to the guidelines.
6. That the following mitigating factors are to be considered prior to rendering a decision: despite the good health of the tree the long-term limitations of the tree due to the proximity of the tree to the structure and the grading of the property to allow water to run away from the structure are considered. The crickets are not visible from the street and will protect the original structure. The cellar windows are not original to the structure.”

Acey Worthy seconded the motion with all members VOTING AYE. (6-0)

Action

Sue McHugh continued, “I, therefore, move based on the testimony presented, the adopted Findings of Fact and the adopted Historic District Design Guidelines that the Commission approve H-02-2020 and issue a certificate of appropriateness for all components listed apart from the sunroom openings which is tabled for more information on how the doors and windows will be replaced after the demolition of the sunroom addition. The demolition may take place immediately.”

Acey Worthy seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (6-0)

**H-03-2020, 602 S. Fulton Street–Carl and Luanne Short (owner/applicant)**

Request

After-the-fact removal of one (1) Deodar Cedar tree on right side of house along W. Marsh Street. Replant with one evergreen upon the advice of Aborguard and/or the city arborist.

“Chip” Short was sworn in for testimony.

Catherine presented the case for the E. A. Goodman House which is in the West Square Local Historic District. The Colonial Revival house was built circa 1936 is listed at pivotal.

“Instead of one tree being removed two trees were removed.” Chip Short passed out a copy of an email.

The property featured two (2) mature Deodar Cedar trees flanking the entrance to the home. The property owner contacted staff in 2019 regarding the removal of the trees. The property owner was originally told the tree to the right of the front door could be removed, and the tree on the left appeared healthy, but no further action was taken and no COA was issued.

The property owner contacted staff again in January of 2020 regarding the trees. Due to the length of time, the city arborist, Mark Martin, was asked to re-evaluate the trees. At this time, it was discovered that the information relayed to the property owner in April 2019 was incorrect. With a second evaluation by Stephen Brown, both arborists confirmed that the tree to the left of the house was damaged/dead at the top, while the tree on the right appeared healthy despite the yearly power line trimming. Mr. Brown noted that the tree already had new growth on it this year since it was last cut. The applicant was advised of the unfortunate mix-up and was given the process for moving forward for removal of the tree on the right, which required approval by the Commission since there was no evidence that the tree was damaged or dead. A more detailed timeline is provided, below:

- April 16, 2019: Property Owner contacted City about tree removal. An email was sent with incorrect information regarding which of the two trees could be approved for removal at a staff level. No COA was obtained by the property owner.
- January 16, 2020: Property Owner contacted City regarding removing both trees. Mark Martin was asked to re-evaluate the trees.
- January 17, 2020: Mark Martin reported that tree on the right side of the house appeared to be healthy and that tree on the left side of the house was decayed/dead in the top. This met criteria for staff-level approval of tree removal, which states “Removal of a tree larger than 18 inches in diameter at 4.5 feet above the ground that is diseased or severely damaged and approved by the director of Community Planning or designee and replaced with a similar type plant material (pg. 13).”
- January 17, 2020: Staff contacted Property Owner to relay report from Mr. Martin. This is when the error was noted in the April 16, 2019, email to property owner. Property owner was informed that because no COA was obtained, previously sent emails did not suffice as approval. Staff advised Property Owner of need to appear before Historic Preservation Commission to obtain approval to remove the tree on the right side of the house.
- January 22, 2020: Email was sent by staff to Property Owner confirming Mr. Martin’s evaluation and notifying property owner of need to obtain COA for removal of tree on right side of the house.

- January 23, 2020: Stephen Brown was asked to give a second opinion of trees at the property owner's home. Mr. Brown affirmed Mr. Martin's evaluation. Property owner was advised as such.
- January 24, 2020: property owner requested an appeal from Teresa Barringer, Zoning Administrator, regarding whether the tree on the right of the house could qualify for a staff approved COA, as stipulated above.
- January 27, 2020: Staff confirmed that the tree did not meet the requirement of being "diseased or severely damaged" to qualify for a staff approved COA. Property owner was given until the end of the day to submit a COA for the February 13, 2020, HPC meeting and given until January 31, 2020, to submit a report indicating the tree's health for review by the Commission. A COA was submitted requesting removal of both trees.
- January 28, 2020: Staff created two (2) COA applications: one for removal of tree on left to be signed by staff and one for removal on tree of right of house to track for the Commission. COAs were sent to property owner for signature.
- January 28, 2020: Staff was notified by a neighbor that both trees were actively being removed beginning with tree on the right of the house. Staff dispatched Code Enforcement Manager Michael Cotilla to property who confirmed that as of noon, the tree on the right was completely removed and tree on left was partially removed. Staff also contacted property owner who confirmed that he was having both trees removed and acknowledged he acted without COA.

Staff does not have the authority to sign a COA for staff approval of the removal of the tree on the right of the house, as it was not diseased or severely damaged. A COA was not issued in 2019—there was e-mail correspondence. There was a miscommunication and an unfortunate event. We have changed our policy at the staff level; a COA must be submitted on the first contact before triggering the arborist to come look at a tree.

Chip Short stated that they would have liked to have been able to save the trees. They tried their best to save the one on the left. "When Asplundh came through last spring and chopped the other tree in half, we applied for permission to remove both trees. All of the weight of the remaining tree is on the house side of the property—standing over our bedroom.

"We hired Arboguard to assess the tree on the left. Based upon the visual findings the likelihood of a whole tree or trunk failure within a 1-year timeframe is possible. This tree has several cavities ranging from the root flair of this Deodar Cedar all the way to the upper parts of its crown. The cavities and areas of decay will not reverse or heal and are sure to continue to digress. This digression will only continue to advance strength loss based upon the strength loss percentages and the likelihood—this tree should be considered a high risk."

Mr. Short said, "We thought we had the authority to remove both trees. We will replant the trees."

#### Public Comment

None

Deliberation

The trees are gone. The solution is to replant appropriate trees. It is good to hear the City has changed their procedure.

There are concerns in the community about the way Asplundh trims trees on behalf of Duke Energy. They may not look good, however, they are good arborist cuts.

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-03-2020**:

1. That Chip Short, owner/applicant, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness
2. For the property located at 602 S. Fulton Street and designated within the West Square Local Historic District.
3. The applicant appeared before the Commission and described the project as follows: After-the-Fact removal of one (1) Deodar Cedar tree on right side of house along W. Marsh Street and replace with one evergreen upon advice of Arboguard and/or City Arborist.
4. That the following Historic District Design Guidelines were considered for this application, specifically: Chapter 4.5 – Landscaping: Guidelines 4.5.1, 4.5.2.
5. That no one appeared before the Commission to present testimony and evidence related to the Guidelines.
6. That the following mitigating factors are to be considered prior to rendering a decision: the removed trees will be replaced with evergreens upon professional advice.”

Jon Planovsky seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (6-0)

Action

Sue McHugh continued, “I, therefore, move based on the testimony presented, the adopted Findings of Fact and the adopted Historic District Design Guidelines that the Commission approve H-03-2020 as submitted, and issue a certificate of appropriateness because the replanting of the trees follows the design guidelines requirements.”

Jon Planovsky seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (6-0)

**HISTORIC LANDMARK APPLICATIONS**

**HL-02-2019, 124 S. Ellis Street—Jon Planovsky and Robert Lambrecht (owner/applicant); Pete Prunkl (agent)**

Jon Planovsky was recused from the dais; Jon Planovsky and Pete Prunkl were sworn in for testimony.

Request

Review pre-application for local historic landmark designation. The applicant is requesting to designate the exterior of the identified buildings.

Does this house appear to have enough significance as a potential landmark to move forward with the investigation? The HPC votes to make a recommendation to City Council; City Council makes the final determination and adoption of the local landmark status.

Staff presentation by Catherine Garner; Pete Prunkl provided photos and a PowerPoint presentation on behalf of the applicant.

Listed as the Moore House (NR Nomination), it is classified as contributing. According to the National Register, the house was constructed circa 1898 (Deed Book 75, Page 568, it was 1891).

**Architect:** Beulah Stewart Moore, homeowner/artist

**Historic Districts:** Salisbury National Register, West Square Local Historic District

**Square feet:** 7,000

**Historic period:** Victorian

**Architectural Style:** Shingle style with engaged tower, shake shingles upper levels, Richardson Romanesque central entrance of uncoursed fieldstone. Roof was originally wood shingles but was replaced with asphalt shingles for safety reasons. Rotten shingles were replaced.

**Outbuildings:** Two contemporary sheds

**Driveway:** On north side of house, no garage

A noted Salisbury figure, Beulah Stewart Moore made significant contributions to Salisbury and Rowan County. Beulah was the daughter and granddaughter of editors of *Salisbury Watchman*. She studied art in New York City with Elliot Dangerfield and William Merritt Chase; Dangerfield spoke to local artists in Moore House, 1894. Beulah designed the house at 124 South Ellis Street. She was a historian and publicist for North Carolina Daughters of American Revolution, 1907, 1908 and 1909. She was a founding member and first president of Travelers Club, the first group to advocate for a public library. She championed use of 1854 courthouse as a Community Building and the first woman to run for mayor of Salisbury.

The exterior alterations to the house, other than the roof, were done by Beulah. When she started teaching art upstairs in the rear bedroom, she created a straight roof to the side porch and added a door where a window had been so they could go outside. (The house was struck by lightning twice in one day while she was teaching class.) She added a room on the driveway side, too.

Jon touched on the interior features. There are eight fireplaces in the house that she plugged up with newspapers. She then installed steam heat.

The Shufords altered the foyer in the early 60s. Jon said, “My goal is to redo the columns and spandrels in the foyer. We have a photocopy of the original floorplan drawing and ideas on canvas. We have photos from all the previous owners. The kitchen was never intended to be used by Beulah.”

Public Comment

None

Deliberation

Sue said, “I was worried about the room addition in the back, but if that was done by Beulah—the original architect—it may be alright.”

Acey said, “I think it meets the criteria to move forward.”

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

Steve Cobb 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 #**HL-02-2019**:

1. That Jon Planovsky appeared before the Commission and sought approval of a pre-application for local historic landmark designation.
2. For certain buildings, structures, sites, areas, and/or objects located at the following properties: 124 S. Ellis Street (Moore House).
3. That the applicant submitted a completed pre-application to the Commission which attested to the *special significance* and *integrity* of the subject buildings, structures, sites, areas, and/or objects.
4. That the following criteria were considered for this pre-application, specifically: *special significance* and *integrity* as described in Chapter 15 of the Land Development Ordinance.
5. That Pete Prunkl appeared before the Commission to present testimony and evidence related to the Guidelines.
6. That there are no mitigating factors to be considered prior to rendering a decision.

Acey Worthy seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (5-0)

Action

Steve Cobb continued, “I, therefore, move based on the testimony presented, the adopted Findings of Fact and the adopted procedures as outlined in Chapter 15 of the Land Development Ordinance that the Commission approve HL-02-2019 as submitted, and approve the historic landmark pre-application.

Sue McHugh seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (5-0)

Jon Planovsky returned to the dais.

**HL-01-2018, 213 S. McCoy Road–Roy and Norma Campbell (Owner/Applicant); Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer (Authorized Agent)**

Roy and Norma Campbell, Karen Lilly-Bowyer were sworn in for testimony.

Request

Review and approve application for local historic landmark designation of the “Grubb-Sigmon-Weisiger House” and make recommendation to Salisbury City Council regarding adoption of a local landmark designation ordinance.

Catherine Garner made a staff presentation of the Grubb-Sigmon-Weisiger House, which is individually designated in 1999 on the National Register of Historic Places. Built Ca. 1911 it is a Queen Anne style home. It was constructed over the years: 1911, 1927 and 1942 are significant dates.

The applicants request to designate the property as a local historic landmark—the complete exterior of the “Grubb-Sigmon-Weisiger house” including the complete exterior of the main house, the exterior of the guest house, and the exterior of the playhouse. These buildings comprise lots 168 and 169 of the total property, Rowan County Parcel ID # 335 100, as delineated on the designation report map. (The modern garage is located on lot #167.)

In April 2018, the HPC approved the petitioner’s pre-application based on a preliminary assessment that the property was likely to meet the designation criteria and therefore qualify as a local historic landmark.

Next, the petitioner produced the required Survey & Research Report (S/R Report), also known as the “designation report”. Planning staff submitted this report to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), as required, in order to provide state preservation specialists an opportunity to review and comment on the proposal. SHPO’s response identified that the designation report satisfied their requirements.

The HPC must determine whether the proposed landmark meets the required “special significance” and “integrity” criteria. These criteria are outlined in NCGS 160A-400.5, below:

“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” (NCGS 160A-400.5. Designation of landmarks; adoption of an ordinance, criteria for designation).

The applicant proposes that the “Grubb-Sigmon-Weisiger” should be recommended for local historic landmark designation because, as described in detail in the designation report:

- The proposed landmark meets the “**significance**” criterion because it is a unique Queen Anne style house in a Colonial Revival-style new suburban small estate residential area

being developed by the Salisbury Development Company, and as an important surviving example of a Queen Anne-style farmhouse within the City Limits. (*NCGS 160A-400.5*)

- The proposed landmark meets the “**integrity**” criterion because it has not been substantially altered since its designation period of significance, and retains integrity in most or all of the following six aspects: design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association. The exteriors and interiors requested for designation retain most of their material integrity, though only the exterior is requested for designation. (*NCGS 160A-400.5*)

Karen added that the house has cultural significance in the area. “It is much more elaborate than the average Queen Anne Style farmhouse. The maintenance and integrity of the house is beyond reproach.”

Photographs and the report were shared with the Commissioners. The house originally faced toward the railroad track. It was later turned (in 1927) to face McCoy Road. This change was documented and accepted in the National Register documentation. The guest house is on the location of the original servants’ quarters. The playhouse was added by Mr. Sigmon, who was one of the principals in the Salisbury Development Corporation (before the crash).

1974-75 a shallow service porch is recessed in the offset. During the Allen ownership (after the Weisiger ownership) it was enclosed with six-over-six sash windows above a vertically sheathed apron. A door leads to an eastward walkway to the guest house.

The asbestos roof was replaced 20 years ago by the current owner with a composite material-composite slate. It was again replaced two years ago due to improper installation. Now it is a shingle that resembles slate. The guest house has the original slate on it.

#### Public Comment

None

#### Deliberation

The letter from SHPO doesn’t provide any information. Andrew Walker said he has some issues with the integrity. It is a magnificent Queen Anne house with a strong provenance for its history. The farmhouse status is very important. There have been a lot of changes since the original farmhouse was built. It is unlikely that roofs of 100-year-old buildings are original. Landmarks must meet very high standards.

Elizabeth Trick said the associated outbuildings are still in good shape.

Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer chimed in, “The little playhouse was constructed in the 1920s. It was a part of the estate development before the money dried up. Salisbury Development Corporation went bankrupt. After WWII, soldiers needed housing so the land was sold off and chopped up. The houses in the middle sit where the golf course was supposed to be. It has cultural significance for the area.”

Sue McHugh said that the vague letter from SHPO indicates that it satisfies requirements for local significance and integrity.

#### 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 # **HL-1-2018**:

1. That Roy and Norma Campbell owner/applicant, and Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer (agent) appeared before the Commission and sought approval for local historic landmark designation of the Grubb-Sigmon-Weisiger House, and a recommendation to Salisbury City Council regarding adoption of a landmark designation ordinance.
2. For the following portions of the property at 213 S. McCoy Road, Salisbury, NC; specifically, Tax Map and Parcel # 335 100: the complete exterior portion of the house, the ca. 1941 Guest House, and the Ca. 1928-1930 Playhouse and the portions of the property formerly known as lots 168 and 169.
3. That the applicant submitted a landmark application and designation report to the Commission which described the *special significance* and *integrity* of the proposed landmark.
4. That the following criteria were considered for this application, specifically: *special significance* and *integrity* as described in North Carolina General Statutes 160A-400.5.
5. That no one else appeared before the Commission to present further testimony and evidence related to the proposal.”

Steve Cobb seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (6-0)

#### Action

Sue McHugh continued, “I, therefore, move based on the testimony presented, the adopted Findings of Fact and the adopted procedures as outlined in Chapter 15 of the Land Development Ordinance that the Commission approve HL-1-2018 as submitted, and recommend to the Salisbury City Council that the “Grubb-Sigmon-Weisiger House”, as contemplated herein, be designated a Salisbury Historic Landmark.

Because:

- The proposed landmark meets the “significance” criterion because it is a unique Queen Anne style house in a Colonial Revival-style new suburban small estate residential area that was being developed by the Salisbury Development Company, and is an important surviving example of a Queen Anne-style farmhouse within the City Limits (NCGS 160A-400.5)
- The proposed landmark meets the “integrity” criterion because it has not been substantially altered since its designation period of significance, and retains integrity in most or all of the following six aspects: design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association. The exteriors requested for designation retain most of their material integrity and have been carefully restored to retain integrity. (NCGS 160A-400.5)

Acey Worthy seconded the MOTION. Andrew Walker VOTED NAY, Jon Planovsky abstained because he did not know NCGS 160A-400.5, Sue McHugh, Steve Cobb, Acey Worthy and Elizabeth Trick VOTED AYE. (4-1 with one abstention)

The Landmark process and status will be examined and studied.

NOTE: The lights in the AV presentation system shutdown automatically.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Minor Works Report was received by consensus.

Jonathan Post did not appeal his case.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

January 9, 2020, minutes were approved as submitted.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

---

Andrew Walker, Chair

---

Diana Cummings, Secretary