

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes March 12, 2020

The City of Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission met in regular session at 5:15 p.m. Thursday, March 12, 2020, at 217 S. Main Street in the Council Chamber.

Present: Will James, Sue McHugh, Jon Planovsky, Larry Richardson, Elizabeth Trick, Andrew Walker and Acey Worthy

Absent: Steven Cobb, and Eugene Goetz

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

Elizabeth Trick will recuse herself for H-05-2020 and Acey Worthy will recuse himself for H-06-2020.

NEW CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

H-04-2020, 100 W. Innes Street–City of Salisbury (owner/applicant); Deborah Young (agent)

Catherine Garner and Deb Young were sworn in for testimony.

Request

Add egress door/gate to ensure fire escape egress remains open.

Identification of Property

Catherine Garner made a staff presentation with photos.

The contributing Wallace-Grubb building (AKA The Plaza) is located in the Downtown Local Historic District. Built Ca. 1900 it is Second Renaissance Revival style.

The City of Salisbury is requesting approval to install a metal gate within the recessed opening of the fire escape at the western end of the West Innes Street façade of the Wallace-Grubb Building, now known as the Plaza. The gate proposed is custom to replicate the metal handrail on the same façade elevation that secures the stairs to the building's basement. The metal gate is proposed to be painted in the 'Salisbury Green' color to match the existing railing and adjacent decorative street lights, as well as the wooden storefront elements on the first floor. The gate is intended to keep the fire egress area clear so that in case of emergence, building occupants could exit and emergency responders could enter if necessary. As proposed, the gate does not appear to detract from the building and could be removed in the future without causing permanent alterations to the structure. Minor damage for the mounting of the gate would be incurred, but would likely not cause significant damage if installed sensitively to the material.

- **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.
- **Chapter 3.2 – Exterior Walls, Trim, and Foundations**
 - 3.2.7: It is not appropriate to introduce new wall or foundation features, such as vents, bays, doors, access doors, or window openings, if they would diminish the original design or damage historic materials.
- **Chapter 3.8 – Accessibility and Safety**
 - 3.8.2: Meet health and safety code and accessibility requirements in ways that do not diminish the historic character, features, materials, and details of the building.

Deborah Young reiterated, “The front of the gate will look like the other railing; there will be a push bar as required by fire code and a screen mesh to prohibit people from reaching through to unlock it. Emergency personal would use the key in the Knox Box.”

“The gate would ensure efficient exit from the property in the event of an emergency. This is the second of two egresses. During installation there would be some penetration into the existing material.”

Public Comment

Clyde was sworn in for testimony. “This [doorway] is the home of Edward Suggs. A social worker has taken over.” Edward Suggs is a homeless individual.

Deliberation

Jon said, “The damage is going to be minimal. The materials and scale are appropriate.”

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-04-2020:

1. That Deborah Young, applicant/agent for the City of Salisbury, owner, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness
2. For the property located at 100 W. Innes Street and designated within the Downtown Local Historic District.
3. The applicant appeared before the Commission and described the project as follows: “Add egress door/gate to ensure fire escape egress remains clear.”
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: Guideline 3.2.7; Chapter 3.8 – Guideline 3.8.2.
5. That Clyde appeared before the Commission and presented the following testimony: This is the home of Edward Suggs.”
6. That the following mitigating factor is to be considered prior to rendering a decision: this is the second of the required two fire exits.”

Jon Planovsky seconded the motion with all members VOTING AYE. (7-0)

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-04-2020 as submitted and issue a certificate of appropriateness because it meets the guidelines and it is congruent with the design of the building and the gates can be considered temporary. The installation will do minimal damage to the existing stone.”

Jon Planovsky seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (7-0)

H-05-2020, 420 S. Jackson Street–Walter Omar Garcia Valenzuela (owner); City of Salisbury (applicant), Michael Cotilla (agent)

Jon Planovsky made a MOTION to recuse Elizabeth Trick for this case. All agreed.

Michael Cotilla, Salisbury Code Enforcement Manager, and Walter Omar Garcia Valenzuela were sworn in for testimony.

Request

Full Demolition

Identification of Property

The property is located in the West Square Local Historic District and listed as contributing. It was built circa the early 20th Century and is a Craftsman style.

The City of Salisbury Code Enforcement division is requesting demolition of the property at 420 S. Jackson with a 365-day delay. The delay will provide time for potential alternatives to be explored, whether it is compliance with the minimum housing ordinance by the owner or a sale or transfer of the property to an owner who may bring the property into compliance. As a reminder, North Carolina law prohibits Commissions from denying demolition requests. The maximum a Commission can delay a demolition is 365 days.

Code Enforcement has been working with the current owner since 2018 regarding the condition of this house. For reference, anytime the property changes hands, enforcement proceedings must begin again with the new owner(s). Code Enforcement has worked with previous owners on this property as well. In addition to the house not meeting minimum housing codes, the property is also non-compliant regarding overgrown grass and weeds. The two in combination make it difficult for abatement.

At this time, a COA has been issued by staff to Mr. Valenzuela to make exterior repairs to the property, including rebuilding of the porch, reroofing the porch, and repair of missing siding. The Historic Preservation Commission does not review interior changes, but the property owner is required to meet the City's minimum housing code and North Carolina residential building code.

When the City demolishes the house, the City does not take ownership of the house or the property, so which materials may be salvageable would be at the permission of the property owner. The site will be stabilized and reseeded. Any future development of the property would be reviewed and approved under the guidelines of Chapter 5: New Construction.

- Chapter 6 – Demolition
 - Guideline 6.5.1: Work with the HPC to seek alternatives to demolition.
 - Guideline 6.5.2: If all alternatives have been exhausted, follow these guidelines for demolition:
 - Make a permanent record of a significant structure before demolition. The record shall consist of photographs and other documents, such as drawings, that describe the architectural character and the special features of the building. The HPC determines on a case-by-case basis the precise documentation of a specific building that is required and the person who is responsible for producing that documentation. The documentation must be submitted for review by the HPC before demolition. The record is retained by the City of Salisbury.
 - Work with the HPC to identify salvageable materials and potential buyers or recipients of salvaged materials. The removal of all salvageable building materials before demolition is encouraged, and may be required.
 - Clear the structure quickly and thoroughly.
 - Submit a site plan with the demolition application illustrating proposed landscaping and any other site development to be completed after demolition.
 - Plant the site or appropriately maintain it until it is reused. If the site is to remain vacant for over one year, it should be improved to reflect an appearance consistent with other open areas in the district.

Mr. Cotilla offered a timeline of their involvement. In August of 2016 they tried to ascertain compliance of the violations of the minimum housing and the nuisance ordinance. In September of 2017, the property owners met with the staff liaison and Mr. Cotilla to discuss the violations and to try to develop a plan to move forward to bring the structure into compliance. (Working on the structural integrity and securing from vagrants and the elements.) Work initially began at a rapid pace, but declined to a complete stop. August 2019 the owner began to receive fines for failure to comply with minimum housing ordinance. Work started for a couple weeks, but no work

took place after December 2019. February 2020 the property owner was notified of this hearing and potential demolition.

Due to continued noncompliance and vacant/abandoned status, it qualifies for demolition or up to a 365 day delay to allow the property owner to finish work to bring the structure into compliance, sell the property to someone who will, or self-fund the demolition.

If the Commission approves a 6-month delay and in six months the structure is not into compliance, the effort will be demolished.

Public Comment

Mr. Valenzuela, (580 Cox Mill Rd, Concord 28027) property owner, said that the inside is 40-45 percent demolished. The foundation and walls need to be squared before starting the roof. His crew has set up in Salisbury to begin work, again. He has county permits.

Mark Soeth, 227 W. Monroe Street, was sworn in and shared his credentials (Architectural Conservator, a graduate degree in preservation from Columbia School of Architecture—Preservation Planning, worked for FEMA). He stated that the house does not have a great track record and he is sick of looking at it. He supports demolition in six months.

Karen Hobson, 302 S. Fulton Street, was sworn in. Karen is the former Executive Director for Historic Salisbury Foundation. She has a background in real estate and real estate development/rehabilitation. She had experience with this house. October 2016 when the property owner would not clean up for October tour she and some neighbors did the work since there were two adjacent houses on the tour.

“I speak today in favor of demotion; I think six months is a reasonable period. I hate to see any house demolished—I am not sure this one has any economic value. There are no particular redeeming features inside or out.”

Karen continue, “The property owner has been singularly uncooperative. We made an offer to buy it. There has been repeated problems. The owner will start doing something and stop. I am not convinced that the owner will do what is necessary.”

Laurie Burke, 305 W. Horah Street, was sworn in for testimony. She is a licensed general contractor for the State of North Carolina. “My first request would be to have the house demolished; second request would be to give them a six-month delay for demolition. The property is not currently secure. They are not disposing hazardous materials properly.”

Tim Proper, 315 W. Horah Street, was sworn in for testimony. “I have to look at this house, but my chief concern would be that it is unsecured—wide open from the front and wide open from the back. Four teenage girls and young children live in the immediate area and I am concerned about their safety. I am in support in a narrow timeline.”

Matt Beaver of 308 W. Monroe Street was sworn in for testimony. “Our house backs up to the back yard of this property. I would be in favor of giving them a very short timeline to fix it. I am curious about the criteria. I recommend demolition in six months.”

Mr. Anderson, 3715 Rosehaven Drive, Charlotte, who works with Mr. Valenzuela was sworn in for testimony. The house has termites and leaks. He will try to reproduce the siding. He said that the roofing is 2x4. He will see that the structure is properly secured.

Deliberation

Will James noted a history of broken promises. He asked if Mr. Valenzuela had financing that he needs in place to go forward with the work. Even though Mr. Valenzuela assured the commissioners that six months would be enough time to finish the work, he needs a fire lit under him.

Jon Planovsky said that the problem has been ongoing since 2016 and the neighbors are frustrated. This is the fire to get him going. Jon suggested a 9-month delay because of the COA process.

Sue McHugh went in a different direction to stoke the fire. “Six months takes him straight through the construction season that could easily distract the workers. I am in favor of reducing to 3-4 months to assure some immediate action. The public and the owner seem to feel that a 6-month delay is agreeable.” Andrew Walker believed that the approvals would take away some of the time he needs to complete work.

Acey Worthy noted the request from Code Enforcement for 365-day delay. “The building is in bad shape. This delay gives ample opportunity to complete the work and all permits.”

Larry Richardson did not agree with a year delay because they tend to work two weeks and stop. Code Enforcement has tried unsuccessfully to work with them since 2016. He said he was in favor of a 6-month delay.

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-05-2020**:

1. That Michael Cotilla, agent for the City of Salisbury, applicant, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property owned by Walter Omar Garcia Valenzuela
2. For the property located at 420 S. Jackson Street and designated within the West Square Local Historic District.
3. The applicant appeared before the Commission and described the project as follows: “Full Demolition.”
4. That the following Historic District Design Guidelines were considered for this application, specifically: Chapter 6 – Demolition: Guidelines 6.5.1, 6.5.2
5. That the following individuals appeared before the Commission and presented testimony and evidence related to the Guidelines: Mr. Valenzuela said that he is prepared to secure

the building and that six months is sufficient to bring the property into compliance; Mark Soeth felt that the structure did not have sufficient integrity and that the owner and contractors reputation for slow work warranted a 6-month delay and no longer; Karen Hobson thought that the property had no particular redeeming features and was in favor of demolition (sooner rather than later) and that six months is sufficient time; Laurie Burke requested immediate demolition or 6-month delay—citing that the structure is not safe and that we are not completely aware of the scope of work and whether the work can be completed in the allotted time; Tim Proper stated that the structure is not secure and that it is a hazard for youth in immediate proximity. He is in favor of a sooner demolition; Matt Beaver also stated that the property is not secured. He is in favor of a 6-month delay, citing that he has no confidence in the contractor and owner [completing the work]; and Mr. Anderson proposed they could have the work done in six months.

6. That the following fact to be considered prior to rendering a decision: the owner has said that he has \$128,000 to do the work.”

Larry Richardson 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-05-2020 as amended, subject to the following conditions: the building must be secured for safety for the neighborhood and that a 6-month delay be placed on the demolition in order to allow the owner and contractor to bring the building to minimum housing code in that timeframe.”

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

Elizabeth Trick returned to the dais; Acey Worthy was recused for H-06-2020.

H-06-2020, 312 S. Long Street–William Ronald Arnette (owner); City of Salisbury (applicant), Michael Cotilla (agent)

Request

Full Demolition

Identification of Property

Catherine Garner made a presentation noting that the Ramsey-Ervin House is located in Brooklyn South Square Local Historic District. The Craftsman style home was built circa 1918 is listed as contributing. The parcel is the only one in this block that faces N. Long Street.

The City of Salisbury Code Enforcement division is requesting demolition of the property at 312 S. Long Street with a 365-day delay. The delay will provide time for potential alternatives to be explored, whether it is compliance with the minimum housing ordinance by the owner or a sale or transfer of the property to an owner who may bring the property into compliance.

Code Enforcement has been working with the current owner since 2018 regarding the condition of this house. For reference, anytime the property changes hands, enforcement proceedings must

begin again with the new owner(s). The Commission heard a demolition request from Code Enforcement in January 2014 for demolition, which was approved with a 365 day delay. The current owner has made some strides in bringing the house to minimum housing code, but not enough progress at this time.

When the City demolishes the house, the City does not take ownership of the house or the property, so which materials may be salvageable would be at the permission of the property owner. The site will be stabilized and reseeded. Any future development of the property would be reviewed and approved under the guidelines of Chapter 5: New Construction.

- Chapter 6 – Demolition
 - Guideline 6.5.1: Work with the HPC to seek alternatives to demolition.
 - Guideline 6.5.2: If all alternatives have been exhausted, follow these guidelines for demolition:
 - Make a permanent record of a significant structure before demolition. The record shall consist of photographs and other documents, such as drawings, that describe the architectural character and the special features of the building. The HPC determines on a case-by-case basis the precise documentation of a specific building that is required and the person who is responsible for producing that documentation. The documentation must be submitted for review by the HPC before demolition. The record is retained by the City of Salisbury.
 - Work with the HPC to identify salvageable materials and potential buyers or recipients of salvaged materials. The removal of all salvageable building materials before demolition is encouraged, and may be required depending on the significance of the building.
 - Clear the structure quickly and thoroughly.
 - Submit a site plan with the demolition application illustrating proposed landscaping and any other site development to be completed after demolition.
 - Plant the site or appropriately maintain it until it is reused. If the site is to remain vacant for over one year, it should be improved to reflect an appearance consistent with other open areas in the district.

Officer Cotilla stated that Code Services began working with the property owners at 312 S. Long Street April of 2018 to try to ascertain compliance to the violations of the minimum housing ordinance. The property owners met with the staff liaison at the time and with Officer Cotilla to discuss the violations and to develop a plan to move forward bringing the structure into compliance by working on the structural integrity of the structure and to secure it from both vagrants and the elements. Property owners were advised in 2018 that the structural work was to be permitted and inspected by Rowan County and exterior modifications would require a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) from the City of Salisbury, NC. As of today, neither of those has been done.

Work was started at that time and soon declined. No work took place for over a year until February 2020 when the property owner began receiving fines from Code Services, notification of this meeting and the potential for demolition.

Due to noncompliance and the vacant/abandoned status of the structure, it qualifies for demolition or 365-day delay to allow the property owner to finish all the work needed to bring the structure into compliance, sell the property to someone who will, self-fund demolition, allow Code Services to work to salvage materials holding historic significance before demolition.

This property came to the HPC in 2014 for demolition; it was granted with 365-day delay. The property changed hands, but the situation has been going on for many years.

Public Comment

William Arnette (3521 Ridge Road, Charlotte, NC 28269) was sworn in for testimony. He provided photos. The addition on the rear had substantial termite damage. He tore the back of the house off and secured it. The siding had to be custom made November of last year. It takes six months for the lumber to dry or else it will shrink. The lumber has separated.

When Mr. Arnette purchased the house in 2015, windows were completely gone. He tried to replicate the windows. The house is secure now. His goal is to make it “like it was built”.

The foundation (underpinning) is going to be replaced by his son who is a brick mason. The work has not been inspected and no permits were pulled at the County.

Anne Lyles, 409 E. Bank Street, was sworn in for testimony. She has lived in her house across the street from this property for 29 years. “I am on the Board of Directors for Historic Salisbury Foundation who has written to the owner to see if they could assist them. I have cleaned up the yard and trimmed bushes, along with other neighbors, to keep the neighborhood looking nice.”

“We care that the house is on the site of the former Civil War Prison. One of the escape tunnels opened up under this house.”

The 2008 recession and bank foreclosure affected the condition of the house. Some architectural elements of the house were rescued and are in Anne’s building. The current owner is aware that she has these items. The previous owner had put on a roof and removed vinyl siding.

Deliberation

“The property is unique in character,” Sue said. It has historic significance and the previous owner did significant work through the appropriate channels. The current work is going slower than we would like to see. “I think we should consider a longer demolition delay—12 months.”

Elizabeth Trick would like to see Mr. Arnette get Rowan County inspections involved as soon as he can and before doing anything else.

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-06-2020**:

1. That Michael Cotilla, agent for the City of Salisbury, applicant, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property owned by William Ronald Arnette
2. For the property located at 312 S. Long Street and designated within the Brooklyn South Square Local Historic District.
3. The applicant appeared before the Commission and described the project as follows: “Full Demolition.”
4. That the following Historic District Design Guidelines were considered for this application, specifically: Chapter 6 – Demolition: Guidelines 6.5.1, 6.5.2
5. That William Arnett and Anne Lyles appeared before the Commission and presented the following testimony and evidence related to the Guidelines: Mr. Arnette has been working on repairing siding and replicating existing windows; Anne Lyles supports saving the property for its historic significance and added that the previous owner had done work through the appropriate channels.
6. That the following mitigating factors are to be considered prior to rendering a decision: Mr. Arnette has not received appropriate permits from Rowan County and should proceed to do so, quickly.”

Will James 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-06-2020 as amended, subject to the following conditions: Mr. Arnette to complete the work in 365 days.”

Will James seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (6-0)

Acey Worthy was returned to the dais.

H-07-2020, 803 N. Main Street–Salisbury Community Development Center (CDC) (owner/applicant); Michael Kepley (agent)

Michael Kepley was sworn in for testimony.

Request

Install (2) windows on rear of original structure. The new windows will be sized (1) 48” wide and 80” tall in Master Bedroom and (2) 44” wide and 60” tall in kitchen, matching the size windows that are in each room. Windows will have brick mold that matches original trim and be wood divided lite with matching grid pattern.

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.

At the February 2020 HPC meeting (H-02-2020), the Commission heard a request regarding rehabilitation of this house that included the removal of a non-original sunroom and restoration of the back wall of the house. At the Commission's direction, the applicant did some additional scoping to determine what original openings might have existed on the rear wall prior to its alteration for the sunroom.

At this time, the applicant is proposing one window to be 48 inches wide by 80 inches tall in the master bedroom and one window to be 44 inches wide by 60 inches tall in the kitchen. The applicant states that the windows proposed would be wood divided lite with a grid pattern to match the other original windows on the structure with a brick mold surround. There is a note above one of the pictures in the supporting documents that the kitchen door opening appears to have been 36 inches wide.

This proposal appears to restore the rear façade of the home closer to its original appearance in a manner that is sensitive to the style and design of the home with appropriate materials.

- **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.
- **Chapter 3.2 – Exterior Walls, Trim, and Foundations**
 - 3.2.2: Retain and preserve all wall and foundation features that are character defining features, including: ...
 - Foundation vents and grilles, access doors, lattice panels, water tables, and steps.
 - 3.2.7: It is not appropriate to introduce new wall or foundation features, such as vents, bays, doors, access doors, or window openings, if they would diminish the original design or damage historic materials.
- **Chapter 3.3 – Windows and Doors**
 - 3.3.3: If replacement of a window or door element is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, pane or panel division, material, method of operation, and detail.
 - 3.3.10: Similarly, it is not appropriate to introduce new windows or doors if they would diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features.

Michael Kepley did some investigation on the house and found there were probably windows in the two openings. He could not tell the exact height of the windows, but assumed they were the height of the windows that are in the kitchen and master bedroom. He sized the windows according to what was there on other walls. (Three over one.)

Public Comment

None

Deliberation

Andrew Walker explained the request from the Commissioners from the February meeting.

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-07-2020:

1. That Michael Keply, agent for the City of Salisbury Community Development Corporation, owner/applicant, 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: “Install two (2) windows on rear of original structure. The new windows will be sized (1) 48” wide x 80” tall in Master Bedroom and (2) 44” wide x 60” tall in kitchen, matching the size windows that are in each room. Windows will have brick mold that matches original trim and be wood divided lite with matching grid pattern.”
4. That the following Historic District Design Guidelines were considered for this application, specifically: Secretary of the Interior’s Standards: Standard #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
5. That no one 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.”

Will James seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (7-0)

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-07-2020 as submitted, and issue a certificate of appropriateness because the proposed work appears to restore the rear façade of this structure to its original appearance in a manner that is sensitive to the style and design of the home with appropriate materials.

Jon Planovsky seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (7-0)

H-08-2020, 616 W. Council Street – Randy Huffman (owner/applicant)

The owner was not present so the case was tabled to the next meeting.

Request

Replacement of driveway using new materials on both sides of home. Left side is completed, After-the-Fact COA penalty paid. Would propose same to right side of home.

HISTORIC LANDMARK APPLICATIONS

We have not received any new applications or pre-applications.

Tuesday, March 17, 2020, at 6 p.m. City Council will consider a 6-month moratorium (pause) on accepting applications and consideration of local historic landmarks. Council is looking for information/education on the tax credits.

The HPC members and staff will receive training in the future; Catherine is working on the details. The Corona Virus (COVID-19) is affecting the details of how that will take place.

Clyde asked the status of his application.

Catherine Garner said, “We currently have four local historic landmarks: The Temple House at 1604 Statesville Boulevard, The Empire Hotel, The Depot, Grubb-Sigmon-Weisiger House - 213 S. McCoy.”

OTHER BUSINESS

- Minor Works Report was received by consensus.
- Andrew Walker and Acey Worthy were reappointed to the HPC by City Council. Election of Chair and Vice Chair will take place at the next HPC meeting.
- The March 19, 2020, Boards and Commission reception has been postponed.

GOALS

Proposed 2020 HPC Goals:

PROMOTE Historic Districts

- Continue Historic Preservation Incentive Grant Program. Grants for owner-occupied historic structures in the local historic districts. We request \$40,000 every year. There is great need for this grant.
- Partner with other groups on initiatives that help support historic neighborhoods and downtown.

IMPROVE Procedures

- Obtain additional training (Certified local government—COG training is an annual requirement.)
- Improve tracking and enforcement of Certificates of Appropriateness (need to do a mass mailing) Elizabeth Trick asked how we can notify new homeowners in the local historic districts through customer service and water connections.

IDENTIFY Historic Resources

- Define objectives and goals for Local Historic Landmarks; improve processes related to review of applications for landmark status. Once this is completed, it will need to be incorporated into the Design Guidelines. After that, the entire guidelines will need review and updating.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 13, 2020, minutes were approved as submitted.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

NOTE: Due to the COVID-19 Virus/Corona Virus, The City of Salisbury, NC is limiting public contact. Please check the website for closures, cancellations and postponed events.

<https://salisburync.gov/Government/Communications/Newsroom/covid-19-cancellations-postponements-and-closings-for-city-of-salisbury>

Andrew Walker, Chair

Diana Cummings, Secretary