

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes December 10, 2020

The City of Salisbury Historic Preservation Commission met in regular session at 1 p.m. Thursday, December 10, 2020, at 217 S. Main Street in the Council Chamber. Social distancing and safety measures were used to protect staff and citizens.

Present: Steven Cobb, Eugene Goetz, Will James, Sue McHugh, Jon Planovsky, Andrew Walker and Acey Worthy

Absent: Elizabeth Trick and Larry Richardson

Staff Present: Catherine Garner and Diana Cummings

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. COVID 19 practices were part of the meeting explanation.

EX PARTE COMMUNICATION/ CONFLICT OF INTEREST OR APPEARANCE OF CONFLICT

Steve Cobb will recuse himself for case #HL-01-2020; Jon Planovsky will recuse himself for HL-02-2019.

Staff liaison Catherine Garner was sworn in for testimony.

NEW CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

H-43-2020, 1526 N. Main Street–Rachel Olson, owner/applicant

Rachel Olson was sworn in for testimony.

Request

Replace entire roof with 3-foot-wide sheet metal in burgundy.

Identification of Property

Catherine Garner made a staff presentation. The house is located in the North Main Street local historic district. The Porter-Hess House is a late Victorian style home built circa 1910 and classified as fill due to changes over time.

Staff Findings

Staff finds that the project is incongruous with the character of the District because:

1. The existing roof is a stamped metal shingle material. The proposal is to replace the individual shingles with three foot wide metal sheets. It is unknown if the metal sheets will be true standing seam of the 5V barn roofing. This is incongruous with Guidelines 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.4.2, which state historic roofing material should be retained, but if it must be replaced, it should match the historic in size, shape, color, pattern, and texture.
2. The National Register listing for the property describes the house as fill due to changes to the siding, façade, and original porch in the 1970s, but specifically states “the basic shape and high hip roof with projecting front and side gables remain” original to the house. As the only remaining unaltered element on the structure, it is even more important that the roof retain its integrity. The standing seam, whether traditional or modern 5V, would alter the look of the roof and would not closely mimic the installation method, pattern, or detail of the roof (Guideline 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.4.2).
3. The roof is a significant feature of a Victorian house due to overall pitch and number of gables. A vertically seamed metal roof would overly emphasize the roof on the structure due to the reflectivity and sheen of the material, as well as the ribbing of the metal panels. Without documentation, the change is likely to create a false historical appearance as well as overly emphasize one portion of the house (Guideline 3.4.1, Secretary of the Interior’s Standards #3 and #6).

Staff Recommendation

Based on the preceding findings, staff recommends that the Commission deny H-43-2020 at the Porter-Hess House, located at 1526 N. Main Street, within the North Main Street Local Historic District (Parcel ID: 004 071).

The applicant chose the metal time roofing for financial reasons and requested information on possible financial assistance for optional materials. The metal shingles have been coated (tar) and patched where they look like asphalt shingles. To replace with original type materials would cost around \$30,000.

There is a sense of urgency because the roof is leaking. Water damage is causing the roof of a front porch to collapse. The section of roof is asphalt. Images were provided.

Public Comment

No one spoke in favor or opposition.

Deliberation

Steve Cobb stated that the roof looks like an asphalt shingle roof due to the coating. Jon Planovsky said, “There are very few Victorian elements left.” The roof has a high pitch and a lot of exposure.

Will James noted that the fact it is a “fill” house could be a mitigating circumstance. The main feature of the house is the roof. Acey recognized that the roof looks like an asphalt shingled roof.

Motion

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 #**H-43-2020**:

1. That Rachel Olson, owner/applicant appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property located at 1526 N. Main Street and designated within the North Main Street Local Historic District.
2. The proposed project is incongruous as detailed in the application and staff findings numbers 1-3 and incorporated herein; mitigating factors include the metal shingle roof has been coated many times in the past with an asphalt-like coating that obscures the appearance of the metal shingle and makes it appear like an asphalt-shingled roof. We find that 3.4.3 applies; the asphalt shingle would be an acceptable contemporary substitute material that closely imitates historic roofing materials appropriate to the structure. This structure has been designated as fill structure—it has been modified fairly extensively from its original appearance over the years. Part of the existing roofing system is already covered with asphalt shingles and rolled roofing.

Sue McHugh seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (7-0)

Roll Call: Steve Cobb (AYE), Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and Acey Worthy (AYE) (7-0)

Action

Steve Cobb made a MOTION “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-43-2020 subject to the conditions detailed in the Findings-of-Fact. (Applicant can submit a minor works COA to confirm the asphalt shingles.)

Motion was seconded by Sue McHugh with all members VOTING AYE. (7-0)

Roll Call: Steve Cobb (AYE), Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and Acey Worthy (AYE) (7-0)

OLD CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

H-41-2020, 509 E. Fisher Street–Mirna Pineda, owner/applicant; Ken Weaver, agent

Ken Weaver was sworn in for testimony. Steve Cobb recused himself. Commissioners agreed.

Request

Windows and doors. Front and back door and wood framed 2 by 2 windows. Wood siding to match existing siding. Demolition of front porch addition and restore to the original front porch.

Identification of Property

This cases started in November but there had been changes to the submittal. The Commission asked the applicant to return with more information. The new report reflects the new information.

Catherine Garner made a staff presentation identifying the Atwell-Thompson House located in the Brooklyn South Square Local Historic District. It is a frame vernacular style listed as contributing and built in two phases—Ca. 1900, 1950.

Staff Findings

Staff finds that the project is partially incongruous with the character of the District because:

1. Applicant proposes to re-clad the historic structure with wood siding to match the existing in width, profile, and thickness per Guidelines 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.2.1.
2. Applicant is proposing to add new windows on the front left (currently enclosed porch) and on all sides of the structure to match the existing windows. This would be double-hung wood windows with two-over-two panes. Existing wood windows should be repaired rather than replaced (Guidelines 3.3.1, 3.3.2).
3. The front door is proposed to be replaced with a wood door with center oval window. However, the proposed door appears to be a modern design and is not appropriate for the architectural style of the house. Surrounding doors are solid material with the exception of the adjacent property at 503 E Fisher Street, which has a door with full glass panes to match sidelights and windows. The window is not appropriate with Guideline 3.3.8 and 3.3.10.
4. The roof structure and material are proposed to remain the same and are consistent with Guidelines 3.4.1.
5. The current porch is partially enclosed on the left, or eastern end. The applicant is proposing to remove the enclosure and restore the porch to a nearly full-width front porch. No evidence of the porch's previous design has been submitted, and the National Register description of the house describes the enclosure as well, but notes that a portion of the original turned balustrade remains. The applicant's design does propose a historically accurate porch that is not incongruous with the architectural style of the house or the similar neighboring houses. The porch should retain its dimensional configuration, wood material, and tongue and groove porch flooring. The balustrade should be replicated off the original design (Guidelines 3.5.1 and 3.5.4).
6. Paint color information has not been submitted to staff for review; conformance with paint color guidelines will be handled at a minor works level.
7. Location of mechanical equipment has not been identified. Per Guideline 3.10.2, the mechanical equipment shall be located in areas that require the least amount of alteration to the appearance and the materials of the building, such as the rear façade and should be screened from view (Guideline 3.10.2).
8. The elevation plans do indicate that the reconstructed portions of the building do have details that will complement the architectural details of the contributing structures in the district, particularly the architecturally similar structures adjacent to the structure in question (Guideline 5.3.5).
9. However, the proposed elevation of the rear addition on the east side is a completely blank wall. This does not keep the rhythm of the fenestration in the structure per Guideline 5.4.5.

10. The applicant is proposing to add a solid wood door on the rear elevation with steps to exit. There are two windows proposed for the rear elevation; one smaller one and one two-over-two double hung wood window to match the rest of the house. No details have been provided on the smaller window in terms of its size, scale, proportion, pane or panel division, material, method of operation, and detail (Guideline 3.3.3).

Updated plans were included in the packet.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the preceding findings, staff recommends that the Commission approve H-41-2020 at the Atwell-Thompson House, located at 509 E. Fisher Street, within the Brooklyn-South Square Local Historic District (Parcel ID: 019 123) subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall return to the Commission for approval of front door that will be consistent with architectural style and period of construction of the house and for approval of small window on rear elevation that will be consistent with existing windows on the structure per Guideline 3.3.3;
2. The rear entry door shall be solid wood with no embedded glass as stated in the application with stairs of brick to match existing steps on the front of the house;
3. The front porch shall retain the tongue and groove flooring and the balustrade shall be constructed to match the historic balustrade on the structure;
4. Paint colors shall be submitted to staff for review for conformance with Chapter 3.9;
5. Mechanical equipment location(s) shall be submitted to staff for review for conformance with Chapter 3.10;
6. The applicant shall receive, prior to commencement of the work, all other required permits or permissions from governmental agencies;
7. Commission staff shall review and approve any revisions or deviations to any portion of the as-submitted work, that qualifies as a minor work, prior to commencement of that portion of the project.

Ken Weaver said he would love to have a window on the door. He will have to replace the rotten tongue and groove porch with same material. The budget on this house is unbelievable since very little was left of the house [after the fire]. It would have be more cost effective to build a new house.

Public Comment

Steve Cobb was sworn in. He stated that Historic Salisbury Foundation has covenants on the property and supports the plan.

Deliberation

Applicant will look for a suitable wood front door. There was never an east side window—it was a fireplace.

One piece of the balustrade remained when register was done. The front of the house did not suffer fire damage so it was likely removed. Sue said she would not challenge the balustrade. Staff can request images from the nomination records. Some properties in the neighborhood have balustrade

and some don't. They are prevalent on the one-story Victorian style houses. They are expensive to maintain.

Motion

Findings-of-Fact

Will James 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-41-2020**:

1. That Ken Weaver, agent for Mirna I. Pineda, owner/applicant appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property located at 509 E. Fisher Street and designated within the Brooklyn South Square Local Historic District.
2. The proposed project is partially incongruous as detailed in the application and staff findings numbers 1-10 and incorporated herein;
3. The findings are subject to the seven conditions recommended by staff and incorporated herein and amended as follows: the applicant shall return to the Commission for approval of a front and a rear door that will be consistent with architectural style and period of construction and specifically including a rear door that may have a window in it. The front porch shall retain the tongue and groove style, although it may be completely new. The owner/applicant shall return with a proposal for a balustrade of appropriate design. Otherwise, staff recommendations shall be applicable.

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

Roll Call: Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and Acey Worthy (AYE) (6-0)

Action

Will James 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-41-2020 subject to the conditions detailed and amended in the Findings-of-Fact.

Acey Worthy seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE.

Roll Call: Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and Acey Worthy (AYE) (6-0)

Steve Cobb was welcomed back to the dais.

H-44-2020, 501 W. Council Street–Maci Edwards, owner/applicant

Request

After-the-Fact wall removal and front yard landscaping

Applicant requested new hearing date of January 14, 2021.

H-47-2020, 105 E. Fisher Street–Wallace Properties, owner; YYZ LLC, owner; Sweet Meadow Café, applicant/agent

Request

After-the-Fact outside patio deck; 24 ft. by 24 ft.; wooden privacy fence, 24 ft. by 24 ft. by 20 ft.

Applicant requested new hearing date of January 14, 2021.

H-48-2020, 223 W. Bank Street–Shawn and Leah Campion, owner/applicant; Natalie Morgan, agent

Leah Campion and Natalie Morgan, 308 S. Franklin Street, China Grove were sworn in for testimony.

Request

Sun porch addition and porch conversion. New brick patio and concrete drive on existing path.

Identification

Located in the West Square local historic district this contributing home was constructed circa the early 20th Century in the Colonial Revival style.

Catherine Garner made a presentation that provided photos and drawings provided by project architect, Natalie Morgan.

Staff Findings

Staff finds that the project is not incongruous with the character of the District because:

1. The sun porch addition and the proposed enclosed porches are located on the least-character defining elevations, though some of the enclosed porch will be visible from the W Bank Street right-of-way. However, it will not encroach beyond the existing gabled room extension into the side yard; thus, it will not be more visually intrusive than the existing house. The additions are each one-story; the enclosed porch will have a continued flat roof while the sunporch addition will have a rear-facing gable that bisects the flat roof across the rear of the house (Guideline 5.4.1, 5.4.3).
2. No character defining elements will be removed, obscured or destroyed. The additions will be tied into the house in the rear and will result in the minimal loss of a portion of the existing rear flat-roofed room, which may have been an earlier addition to the house (Guidelines 5.4.2).
3. The proposed additions will be differentiated from the existing structure but will very closely harmonize with the historic structure. The windows in the proposed sunroom will be a different configuration and method of operation from the double hung windows on the rest of the house. The windows in the proposed enclosed porch will be six-over-six, matching existing windows on the rear of the house. Per the National Register nomination, the historic core of the home had twelve-over-one windows. This will distinguish the historic portion and addition(s) more easily. The roof is also proposed to be different on the gabled sunporch addition. The main body of the house is under a red terracotta tile roof. The architect has stated to staff that this

material is not able to be sourced so she is proposing an asphalt shingle to match in size and color (Guideline 5.4.4, 5.4.5).

4. The proposed cement board siding matches the existing siding on the side and rear elevations of the home (Guideline 5.4.6). The proposed window and door material is not specified in the application, but should be wood to be appropriate per Guideline 5.3.1.
5. The roof form will be blended and materials will be mimicked to provide compatibility without replicating the roof. The terracotta tile shingles are not able to be sourced for this project per the architect. The asphalt shingles will closely match the color and shape and will only be on the sunporch addition on the rear of the home (Guideline 5.4.8).
6. The foundation level will be matched; the rear of the home already has a higher foundation elevation. Some of the exterior portions of the existing foundation will remain in place. There is demolition proposed on the rear foundation elevation for access to the area underneath the proposed sunporch addition; it is possible that these bricks may be reused elsewhere on the project. Portions of the new foundation on the south and west sides will have panels of the cement board siding that are operable for access underneath the foundation. The eastern side, which is the most visible portion of the foundation, will be continuous brick with relief through the appearance of brick piers. While the cement board siding doors are a modern design for a foundation, they are on the least visible portions of the foundation and do not significantly detract from the design of the addition in relation to the house. The color of the doors may mitigate the design further.
7. The existing granite pavers in the existing patio are to be relocated per sheet SD3. A new patio approximately 326.6 square feet is proposed in the area bounded by the existing foundation (underneath the porch to be enclosed) and the proposed sunporch addition. It will be obscured by the existing wood picket fence at the edge of the foundation, which is shown to remain (Guidelines 5.5.1, 5.5.2, 5.5.4, 5.5.6).
8. The existing driveway is on the east side of the house and consists of two rows of granite block pavers leading to the rear side of the house. The applicant is proposing to pave the driveway in concrete at twelve (12) feet in width. While the scale is consistent with historic driveway widths, if the existing paver rows are the historic driveway, it should not be removed for a modern filled concrete driveway. More information is needed from the applicant regarding the history of the driveway to determine if the existing driveway could be removed.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the preceding findings, staff recommends that the Commission approve H-48-2020 at the House, located at 223 W Bank Street, within the West Square Local Historic District (Parcel ID: 010 066) subject to the following conditions:

1. All windows and doors added shall be wood material;
2. ~~The foundation cement board doors shall be painted red to match the surrounding brick in order to further disguise the modern appearance;~~
3. ~~More information on the driveway's origin shall be provided to staff. In absence of evidence to the contrary, the historic driveway shall remain as is;~~
4. Any light fixtures proposed to be located beside doors shall match existing exterior fixtures on the home in size, color, and design.
5. The applicant shall receive, prior to commencement of the work, all other required permits or permissions from governmental agencies;

6. Commission staff shall review and approve any revisions or deviations to any portion of the as-submitted work, that qualifies as a minor work, prior to commencement of that portion of the project.

Leah Campion stated that they have lived there for nine years. There is no evidence that the granite driveway is a historic feature of the house. There are notes about the construction that indicate deliveries were made through an alley at the rear of the property. The alley appears to be abandoned and no longer accessible for this property.

The yard and driveway slope down to the rear and is difficult to use with the present granite pavers. The driveway needs to be wider. Water further complicates use of the driveway even though they have tried to improve drainage. A concrete driveway is more appealing and practical. They have discussed the texture of the concrete driveway and consider a brushed finish is the best. The granite is slick, uneven and unstable.

Natalie Morgan stated that the lower level will be storage space for the homeowner.

The roof of the house is terracotta flat shingle; there are major issues getting this product at this time with plant shutdown. This is not the original roofing material—it was a wood shingle. It was changed in 1929 when the house suffered a fire.

Public Comment

No one spoke in favor or opposition.

Deliberation

There was a great deal of discussion regarding the granite driveway. Some people think it a fine feature of the home. The commission members encouraged using the granite in the design of the new driveway. Concrete is an acceptable material. Keeping the granite apron is a big step in the right direction.

Regarding the point staff made about painting the red to match the brick—the lighter color gives the appearance of piers which sloped properties often have piers. This is at the rear of the house.

Motion

Findings-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-48-2020**:

1. That Natalie Morgan, agent for Shawn and Leah Campion, owners/applicants appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property located at 223 W. Bank Street and designated within the West Square Local Historic District.
2. The proposed project is not incongruous as detailed in the application and staff findings numbers 1-8 and incorporated herein; Leah Campion stated that the original granite block driveway apron will remain intact;

3. The findings are subject to the six conditions recommended by staff and incorporated herein; however, the louvered doors do not need to be painted red but will match the color scheme of the home; the applicant will return with a plan to incorporate the existing granite blocks in the driveway into the overall driveway design to be approved via minor works.”

Steve Cobb seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (7-0)

Roll Call: Steve Cobb (AYE), Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and 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 Guidelines that the Commission Approve H-48-2020 subject to the conditions detailed in the Findings-of-Fact.

Steve Cobb seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (7-0)

Roll Call: Steve Cobb (AYE), Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and Acey Worthy (AYE)

BLOCK #2 (BEGINNING AT 3 PM)

Commissioners took a brief break.

H-49-2020, 209 S. Lee Street–Lee Street, LLC, owner; Tiffany Day, applicant/agent

Tiffany Day was sworn in for testimony.

Request

Add patios on the front of the property.

Identification

Catherine Garner made a staff presentation. The Lanier-Boger-Weant Rental House is located in the Brooklyn South Square Local Historic District. The house is listed as contributing, built circa 1901 and is of the Frame Vernacular style.

(Some people may remember the house as the previous business called Emma’s Restaurant.)

Staff Findings

Staff finds that the project is partially incongruous with the character of the District because:

1. The proposed patios are located on either side of the existing walkway leading from the public sidewalk to the structure. The applicant is proposing to add a white gothic-style picket fence surrounding the two seating areas with the fence extending partially up the walkway towards the building. The location on the front of the structure is incongruous with Guideline 5.5.1.

2. The existing rear yard of the property is already paved and in use as a parking lot. The front yard area is the only remaining undeveloped portion of the property that could be expanded for restaurant use.
3. The patio is proposed to be stamped concrete and will not be attached to the historic building. It could be removed in the future without loss to the historic fabric of the building (Guidelines 5.5.2, 5.5.7). The applicant is proposing a mixture of planted and potted landscaping surrounding the patio to soften the impact and to provide a buffer from the street. However, surrounding the building with an impervious material changes the character of the building on the site. This property and its twin next door seem to serve as transitions between the downtown core and the Brooklyn South Square neighborhood.
4. The applicant is proposing to add pea gravel along the sides of the building. On the north side, there is a small landscaping strip bordered by the City of Salisbury's parking lot. On the south side, there is a wider landscaping strip bordered by the entrance to the parking areas behind this building. Pea gravel, as a stone product, is an appropriate material for the district.
5. The applicant is proposing one (1) light fixture on the south side patio. The light would be pedestrian scaled and will not detract or overly emphasize the property (Guidelines 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, 4.3.9).

Images were provided.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the preceding findings, staff recommends that the Commission approve H-49-2020 at the House, located at 209 S. Lee Street, within the Brooklyn South Square Local Historic District (Parcel ID: 010 326) subject to the following conditions:

- ~~1. The front patios shall be constructed of pea gravel to mitigate the impact of increased impervious surface surrounding the property and preserve more of the historically residential nature of the property;~~
2. The applicant shall submit a spec detail of the selected light fixture to staff prior to installation to ensure it is a pedestrian scaled pole;
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 portion of the as-submitted work, that qualifies as a minor work, prior to commencement of that portion of the project.

A 4-foot fence can be approved at staff level. There is a discrepancy in the guidelines. The minor works table lists 48" and that is a standard picket panel. The back of the guidelines needs to be changed to 48".

Public Comment

No one spoke in favor or opposition.

Deliberation

The commissioners discussed the effects of concrete vs. gravel. Sue did not support gravel because food spillage could attract vermin to the site and could not be easily cleaned. Jon believed that

concrete be safer. Steve said that brick pavers would be a good compromise while allowing water to leave the surface. Will agreed with using brick rather than pea gravel. Acey agreed that pea gravel would not be an appropriate material to set chairs and benches on. As the use has changed, the overall site has changed. It is a residential property in a commercial zone/use. This is unusual and presents a struggle.

Staff based their recommendation on Guideline 5.5.1 which states that location of patio on the front is incongruous; however, the backyard is already paved.

Motion

Findings-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-49-2020:

1. That Tiffany Day, agent for Lee Street LLC, owner/applicant appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property located at 209 S. Lee Street and designated within the Brooklyn South Square Local Historic District.
2. The proposed project is partially incongruous as detailed in the application and staff findings numbers 1-5 and incorporated herein; no further evidence or testimony was provided.
3. The findings are subject to the 4 conditions recommended by staff and incorporated herein. The fence does have a leeway of 42-48 inches per the design guidelines. We recommend striking the recommended pea gravel which is the first staff recommendation.

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

Roll Call: Steve Cobb (AYE), Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and 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 Guidelines that the Commission approve H-49-2020 subject to the conditions detailed in the Findings-of-Fact.”

Jon Planovsky seconded the MOTION with all members VOTING AYE. (5-2)

Roll Call: Steve Cobb (NAY), Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (NAY), and Acey Worthy (AYE) (5-2)

HISTORIC LANDMARK APPLICATIONS

HL-01-2020, 619 S. Main Street–Historic Salisbury Foundation, owner/applicant; Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer, agent

Steve Cobb was recused from the dais.

Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer, 1604 Statesville Boulevard, was sworn in for testimony.

Request

Local Historic Landmark Application.

Identification

In the National Register listing, the property was only found to have significance under Criterion B: properties that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

The applicant is proposing that the N. B. McCanless House is significant also under Criterion C: properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

Integrity is assessed in terms of: design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association. Staff finds that the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless house retains its special significance under Criterion B for Mr. McCanless's contributions to the City's industrial growth and development and residential development in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Staff finds that the house retains integrity in exterior design, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Karen Lilly-Bowyer pointed out that the location is in the middle of a commercial area. Protection of landmark designation would be highly significant.

The state preservation office provided a comment letter with a few suggested changes for nomination clarification. Those changes have been made and resubmitted. Now the commission is charged with making a recommendation to City Council.

Public Comment

No one spoke in favor or opposition.

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 Local Historic Landmark application #**HL-01-2020**:

1. That Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer, agent for Historic Salisbury Foundation, owner/applicant appeared before the Commission and sought a recommendation on a Local Historic Landmark designation for the property located at 619 S. Main Street;
2. The property retains its special significance and integrity as detailed in the application and staff findings and incorporated herein;

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

Roll Call: Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and Acey Worthy (AYE) (6-0)

Action

Sue McHugh continued, “I, therefore, move based on the testimony presented the Commission recommend approval of the Local Historic Landmark Application for HL-01-2020 to the Salisbury City Council.

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

Roll Call: Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Jon Planovsky (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and Acey Worthy (AYE) (6-0)

This is scheduled for the January 5, 2021, City Council meeting.

Steve Cobb returned to the dais.

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

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

Request

Local Historic Landmark Application.

Identification

Located in the West Square Local Historic District

Building: Moore House (1893)

Classification: Contributing

Style: Shingle

As a contributing resource to a National Register Historic District, the property is considered to have significance under Criterion C: properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

The applicant is proposing that the Moore House is significant also under Criterion B: properties that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past and that the property has additional significance under Criterion C: properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type.

Staff finds that the Moore House retains its special significance under Criterion B for Ms. Moore's artistic, social, and civic activism in Salisbury.

Integrity is assessed in terms of: design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association. Staff finds that the Moore House retains its integrity in design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association.

The state historic preservation office rendered comments for minor clarification of the narrative.

There were no questions for Mr. Prunkl and no public comment.

The property is on the edge of the residential district next to commercial. It is imperative that the property be protected. It is a magnificent property.

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 Local Historic Landmark application case #HL-02-2019:

1. That Pete Prunkl, agent for owners Jon Planovsky and Robert Lambrecht, appeared before the Commission and sought a recommendation for local historic landmark designation for the property located at 124 S. Ellis Street;
2. The property retains its special significance and integrity as detailed in the application and staff findings and incorporated herein; no further evidence or testimony was provided.

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

Roll Call: Steve Cobb (AYE), Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and Acey Worthy (AYE) (6-0)

Action

Sue McHugh continued, "I, therefore, move based on the testimony presented the Commission recommend approval of the Local Historic Landmark Application for HL-02-2019 to the Salisbury City Council.

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

Roll Call: Steve Cobb (AYE), Gene Goetz (AYE), Will James (AYE), Sue McHugh (AYE), Andrew Walker (AYE), and Acey Worthy (AYE) (6-0)

Jon Planovsky returned to the dais.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 12, 2020, minutes were approved as submitted.

OTHER BUSINESSMinor Works

The minor works report was received by the commission. There were 100 cases this year.

2021 Meeting Schedule

Staff proposed starting a 3 p.m. meeting start time as we slowly return to normal.

2021 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) for the City of Salisbury will usually hold meetings the second Thursday of each month in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, located at 217 South Main Street, Salisbury, NC.

Any changes to the schedule below will be posted.

2021 MEETING DATE	DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION	PUBLICATION DATE
January 14	December 28, 2020	January 4, 2021
February 11	January 25	February 1
March 11	February 25	March 1
April 15	March 25	April 5
May 13	April 26	May 3
June 10	May 25	May 28
July 8	June 25	June 28
August 12	July 26	August 2
September 9	August 25	August 30
October 14	September 27	October 4
November 10	October 25	October 29
December 9	November 19	November 29

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Andrew Walker, Chair

Diana Cummings, Secretary