The City is operating under a State of Emergency declaration related to the spread of COVID-19. The City Council meeting will be held electronically to remain consistent with limiting physical interactions and the potential spread of COVID-19, and Council Chambers will be closed. The meeting will be streamed live at salisburync.gov/webcast and on the City’s Twitter account. Anyone who wishes to speak during public comment must sign-up by 5:00 p.m. on February 2, 2021 by contacting Kelly Baker at kbake@salisburync.gov or 704-638-5233.

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

5. Mayor to proclaim the following observances:

   AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH February 2021

6. Council to consider the CONSENT AGENDA:

   (a) Adopt Minutes of the Special meeting of October 20, 2020 and Regular meeting of January 19, 2021.

   (b) Approve a Right-of-Way Encroachment by Spectrum for the installation of directional bored duct in the 200 block of West Council Street per Section 11-24 (27) of the City Code.

   (c) Adopt an ORDINANCE amending Section 13, Article X, of the Code of the City of Salisbury related to parking prohibited at all times on Newsome Road.

7. Council to receive public comment. Public comment will begin following adoption of the Consent Agenda. For electronic meetings speakers must sign-up before 5:00 p.m. by contacting Kelly Baker at kbake@salisburync.gov or by calling 704-638-5233. Citizens who are unable to speak during the meeting may submit written comments by 5:00 p.m. to the email above and they will be shared with Council.

8. Council to consider adopting an ORDINANCE establishing a six month moratorium pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 160A-381(e) on the consideration and approval of Historic Landmarks: (Presenter – Senior Planner Catherine Garner)

   (a) Receive a presentation from staff
   (b) Hold a public hearing
   (c) Comments regarding the proposed moratorium will be accepted for 24 hours from the close of the public hearing. Action cannot be taken until the end of the 24 hour period.
9. Council to consider Land Development District Map Amendment Z-03-2020 to rezone one parcel (070 012) located at 417, 421 and 425 Faith Road and 112 Dunham Avenue from Urban Residential (UR8) and Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX) to Corridor Mixed Use (CMX) only: 
(Presenter – Senior Planner Catherine Garner)
(a) Receive a presentation from staff
(b) Hold a public hearing
(c) Comments regarding the proposed rezoning will be accepted for 24 hours from the close of the public hearing. Action cannot be taken until the end of the 24 hour period.

10. Council to consider adopting an ORDINANCE designating the “Moore House” located at 124 South Ellis Street as a Local Historic Landmark. (Presenter – Senior Planner Catherine Garner)

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

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

13. Council to consider adopting a budget ORDINANCE in the amount of $93,000 to appropriate General Fund Balance for bridge repairs and approve a contract in the amount of $185,758 with the North Carolina Department of Transportation for repairs to the North Ellis Street and East Fisher Street bridges. (Presenters – Public Works Director Craig Powers and Public Works Assistant Director Chris Tester)


15. City Manager’s Report.


17. Mayor Pro Tem’s Comments.

18. Mayor’s Announcements and Comments:
(a) The City of Salisbury is seeking applications from citizens who have an interest in serving on one of the City’s Boards and Commissions. Information regarding the Boards and Commissions and an online application are available at www.salisburync.gov under the City Council and Boards and Commissions tab. Applications are also available by emailing Kelly Baker at kbake@salisburync.gov or by calling 704-638-5223.

(b) City Council will hold its annual goal setting Retreat Wednesday, February 10, 2021 at 5:00 p.m. and Thursday, February 11, 2021 at 4:00 p.m. The Retreat will be held virtually via Zoom. The meetings will be livestreamed at www.salisburync.gov/webcast and through the City’s Twitter account. Additional information on the virtual meeting will be posted on the City’s website at www.salisburync.gov under public notices.

19. Adjourn.

Council meetings are streamed live at www.salisburync.gov/webcast
City of Salisbury  
North Carolina

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, in 1976, African American History Month was created by Carter G. Woodson and formally adopted to honor and affirm the importance of African American History throughout our American experience, and serves to promote cultural enrichment, pride, and self-esteem by celebrating the lives and achievements of great African Americans; and

WHEREAS, the 2021 National theme for Black History Month observance is “The Black Family: Representation, Identity, and Diversity;” and

WHEREAS, during the month of February our Nation takes pause to reflect on the injustices and struggles fought and overcome by African Americans throughout our Nation’s history, and to pay tribute to the battles they have fought in the name of equality; and

WHEREAS, African Americans have made valuable and lasting contributions to the City of Salisbury, achieving exceptional success in all aspects of society including business, education, politics, science, and the arts; and

WHEREAS, African American History Month is a time for every citizen to remember the stories and teachings of those who helped build our City and our nation by taking a stance against prejudice to build lives of dignity and opportunity, advanced the cause of civil rights and strengthened our community.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Karen K. Alexander, Mayor of the City of Salisbury, North Carolina, DO HEREBY PROCLAIM the month of February 2021, as

AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

in Salisbury, and encourage all citizens to reflect on past successes and challenges of African Americans and look to the future to continue to improve society so that we live up to the ideals of freedom, equality and justice.

This the 2nd day of February 2021.

____________________________________
Karen K. Alexander, Mayor
REGULAR MEETING

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

ABSENT: Mayor Pro Tem Al Heggins.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

RECOGNITION OF VIEWERS

Mayor Alexander welcomed all viewers.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Thereupon, Councilmember Post made a motion to adopt the Agenda as presented. Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted AYE, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (4-0)
PROCLAMATIONS

Mayor Alexander proclaimed the following observances:

SALISBURY SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK January 24-30, 2021
CATHOLIC SCHOOLS WEEK January 31 – February 6, 2021
NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH January 2021

CONSENT AGENDA

(a) Minutes

Adopt Minutes of the Regular meeting of January 5, 2021.

(b) Right-of-Way Encroachment- Lash Drive

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

(c) Budget Ordinance Amendment- Share 2 Care Fund

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

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

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 29 at Page No. 45, and is known as Ordinance 2021-04.)

(d) Alley Closing- West Cemetery Street

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

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

(The above Resolution is recorded in full in Resolution Book No. 16 at Page No. 1, and is known as Resolution 2021-01.)
ORDER CLOSING A PORTION OF AN ALLEY IN THE 800 BLOCK OF WEST CEMETERY STREET.

(The above Order is recorded in full at the Register of Deeds and maintained in the City Clerk’s Alley Closing file dated January 19, 2021.)

Thereupon, Councilmember Sheffield made a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented. Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted AYE, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (4-0)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Alexander opened the floor to receive public comments.

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

LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARK DESIGNATION- MOORE HOUSE

Senior Planner Catherine Garner addressed Council regarding the proposed designation of the Moore House located at 124 South Ellis Street as a Local Historic Landmark.

Ms. Garner pointed out the Moore House is part of the National Register of Historic Places and is also located in the West Square local historic district. She added the applicant proposes the Moore House become a Local Historic Landmark under Criterion B for the significance of the property associated with the persons significant in their past and its distinctive characteristics of a shingle architectural style roof. She commented the Moore House retains its special significance under Criterion B for the applicant’s artistic, social, and civic activism in Salisbury. She noted the house also retains its integrity in design, setting workmanship, materials, feeling, and association in order to become a landmark under Criterion B.

Ms. Garner pointed out the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) received the Local Historic Landmark pre-application on February 13, 2020 and found the property may meet the requirements to receive the Local Historic Landmark designation. She noted on November 12, 2020 the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) reviewed and provided comments per NCGS: 160D-946. She added on December 10, 2020 the HPC reviewed the final Local Historic Landmark application and found the property contains special significance for its architectural and cultural importance and retains its integrity qualifying the house for the landmark designation. She explained the HPC approved the property to be designated as a Local Historic Landmark by unanimous vote.

Councilmember Post asked if the property owner would receive an elimination or decrease in taxes if the house is designated as a Local Historic Landmark. Ms. Garner agreed. Mr. Post asked about a previous request for a policy review. Ms. Garner explained the review of a
moratorium was scheduled for March 2020 when North Carolina Governor Roy Cooper issued the Stay At Home Executive Order, and Council requested the item be brought back at a later date. She noted this application was already in process at the time the moratorium was being considered.

Councilmember Sheffield reviewed houses that were previously designated as Local Historic Landmarks by Council. She pointed out a great deal of work goes into getting a house designated as a historic landmark.

Councilmember Miller expressed his concern that houses not already a part of a historic district given Historic Landmark status might lessen the momentum to create a neighborhood or district of its own. He explained if the property was not in a historic district he would not agree with the designation, but he supports this house being designated. He suggested a policy be put in place to explain when designations should and should not take place. Councilmember Post commented he supports the designation due to the fact the house meets all the criteria and is in the historic district. Mayor Alexander agreed that since the application was in the process Council should consider it.

b) Mayor Alexander convened a public hearing, after due notice thereof, to receive comments regarding the proposed local historic landmark designation.

Mr. Pete Prunkl pointed out the Moore house was built in 1891 by Ms. Beulah Stewart Moore a noted artist, newspaper editor, social activist, and Salisbury’s first female mayoral candidate. He added her traveler’s club plaque stands outside the Rowan public library. He noted the Moore house is a significant example of a shingle style house based on the designs of national prominent architecture.

Mr. Jon Planovsky thanked Council for its commitment to the City, and for the adoption to the Land Development Ordinance (LDO) regarding landmark designations. He noted there is a tremendous amount of work, resources and funds that go into the designation as well as the benefit it brings to the City. He added the structure and contributions of Ms. Moore are important to the City and the County.

Mr. Christopher Jend presented information regarding the designer of the Moore House, Mr. E.G.W. Dietrich, and he shared illustrations of other houses in which Mr. Dietrich designed. Mr. Jend explained the Moore House has unique characteristics and is a great example of a shingle style house.

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

Senior Planner Catherine Garner addressed Council regarding the proposed designation of the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House located at 619 South Main Street as a Local Historic Landmark.

Ms. Garner pointed out the property is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is not located in a local historic district. She noted the house was built in 1897 and is a second empire styled house. She added the house is found to have significance under Criterion B with properties that are associated with lives of persons significant in the past. She clarified the applicant proposes the house is significant also under Criterion C regarding properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, 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.

Ms. Garner commented it was found the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House retains its special significance under Criterion B for Mr. McCanless’ contributions to the City’s industrial growth and development and residential development in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. She indicated it was also found the house retains integrity in exterior design, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Ms. Garner explained the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) received the Local Historic Landmark pre-application on August 20, 2020 and found the property may meet the requirements to receive the Local Historic Landmark designation. She noted on October 30, 2020 the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) reviewed and provided comments per NCGS: 160D-946. She commented the HPC received and reviewed the final Local Historic Landmark application on December 10, 2020 and found the property has special significance for its architectural and cultural importance. She added it was also found to retain most aspects of its integrity which qualifies it for landmark designation. She explained the HPC approved the property by unanimous vote to be designated as a Local Historic Landmark.

Councilmember Sheffield asked if the landmark designation is for both the exterior and interior of the house and if the kitchen house is included. Ms. Garner noted the designation request is for only the exterior of the house, and she added the kitchen house is part of the request.

Councilmember Miller suggested a policy be created for historic landmark designation and that considerations be only for properties located in a historic district. He added the policy would create an opportunity to develop incentives for property owners to invest in the property to increase its value, as opposed to only tax abatements.

Ms. Garner noted properties like the Napoleon Bonparte McCanless House do not have protection through the National Register, but would receive protection in perpetuity from the landmark designation as long as it meets requirements.

Councilmember Post asked when the historic landmark designation was filed. Ms. Garner commented she will get that information to Council.
b) Mayor Alexander convened a public hearing, after due notice thereof, to receive comments regarding the proposed local historic landmark designation.

Ms. Karen Lilly-Bowyer explained historical information regarding the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House and the property owner, Mr. N. B. McCanless. She reviewed the integrity of the home. She noted the Historic Salisbury Foundation (HSF) requests the Local Historic Landmark designation be approved to provide protection to the historic property.

Ms. Sada Stewart noted the application was submitted prior to the moratorium or policy change request. She pointed out the house exemplifies what the City has to offer, and is a magnificent and regionally unique example of architecture created with locally sourced materials and by expert craftsmen. She commented the HSF owns the property and is proud to play a role in preserving it.

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

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES- EDGAR S. AND MADGE TEMPLE HOUSE

Senior Planner Catherine Garner presented a recommendation regarding eligibility for listing the “Edgar S. and Madge Temple House” located at 1604 Statesville Boulevard in the National Register of Historic Places. She explained the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and City Council are required to receive public comment and provide a report to the State Historic Preservation Office. She stated the National Register Advisory Committee will meet in February and provide final recommendations from the state of North Carolina to the National Register in Washington D.C.

Ms. Garner indicated the Edgar S. and Madge Temple House was constructed in circa 1936. She explained the house has a Spanish Colonial revival style; a hacienda and ranch form, and includes a central courtyard with extensive gardens. She added the detached garage and the chicken house are also included in the National Register nomination. She stated the house was the first local historic landmark in 2017 and if approved at the Park Service level will become an individual listing on the National Register. She noted the proposed listing complies with eligibility criteria because of its distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method of construction that represent the work of a master and possess high artistic value.

Ms. Garner stated the HPC held a public comment period and voted on January 14, 2021 to recommend the proposed listing.

b) Mayor Alexander convened a public hearing, after due notice thereof, to receive comments regarding the proposed listing.
Mrs. Karen Lilly-Bowyer indicated she is pleased that the State Office of Historic Preservation believes the house is architecturally significant and deserves a listing on the National Register. She thanked the City for local landmark designation and Ms. Margaret Klutz for assisting in the pursuit of National Register recognition for the house.

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

Councilmember Sheffield asked if there are other National Registered landmarks within the City. Ms. Garner stated there are approximately 14 properties that are individually listed on the National Register that are in historic districts or standalone properties.

2021 FEDERAL ACTION PLAN

Administrative Services Director and City Clerk Kelly Baker stated a Federal Action Plan was developed in coordination with Ms. Leslie Mozingo and Mr. Ron Hamm with Strategics Consulting. She indicated Mr. Hamm and Ms. Mozingo will present an overview of the plan.

Mr. Hamm thanked staff who participated in the development of the plan. He stated since advocating for the plan in 2020 it has been reorganized and changed. He indicated grant applications have been successful and have yielded the City approximately $1.5 million to $3 million in funds. He stated the strategy used last year should work for several actions that will be pursued in 2021. He pointed out support for local governments is likely to increase with the new administration. He explained staff will work to leverage opportunities and focus on grants, infrastructure packages, and COVID-19 assistance. He added the new administration will prospectively invest in diversity, inclusion, and will assist in creating affordable housing and internet access for low income families.

Councilmember Post pointed out access to broadband has become critical in recent months. He indicated it would benefit the City if funding is identified for the remaining balance of the City’s broadband debt.

Councilmember Miller asked if the list of items in the plan should be shortened. Mr. Hamm noted the list is two pages and of typical length.

Councilmember Sheffield indicated the list of items in the plan is long but it will allow staff to match the items to funding that may be available. She suggested a short list of high priority items also be created.

Mr. Hamm stated there are packages in the works that will assist the homeless population, assist with affordable housing, and for emergency rental assistance. He indicated $25 billion was approved in December and an additional $25 billion has been proposed. He explained an area is required to have a population of 200,000 to receive the money directly. He added the state would
receive 55% and local jurisdictions would receive 45%. He pointed out there is a $350 million proposal for state local governments which hopefully will not have population limits. He stated he hopes to see additional COVID funds in the near future.

Mayor Alexander indicated she attended a meeting with the North Carolina League of Municipalities and met with some of the departments to allow them to get better acquainted with the City. She stated a letter was sent by the United States Congress of Mayors, the National League of Cities, and the North Carolina League of Municipalities to encourage funding that is pro-rata to population. She pointed out it is important that funds are provided directly to cities to replace the loss in revenue.

Mayor Alexander stated education and workforce development should be a priority. She explained according to the Economic Development Commission (EDC) approximately 300 jobs will become available. She added it is important to address job preparation and transportation issues.

Mayor Alexander indicated water systems are also important and should be on the short list of priorities. She explained there will be opportunities to assist neighboring communities with water projects and funding will be necessary.

Mayor Alexander agreed with Councilmember Sheffield regarding the creation of a short list of three to five high priority items. She explained the list can be discussed during the goal setting retreat.

Ms. Mozingo joined the meeting and stated the plan was a group effort, and she believes it will be successful. She thanked Council for trusting her company with its federal advocacy needs. She indicated she will meet virtually with the Congressional delegation and looks forward to Council’s participation.

Thereupon, Councilmember Miller made a motion to adopt the 2021 Federal Action Plan. Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted AYE, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (4-0)

Ms. Baker indicated the Congressional Cities Conference will be held March 7-10, 2021.

Ms. Mozingo stated the meeting dates do not have to be based on the Congressional Cities Conference dates and can be altered to accommodate Council.

Councilmember Miller indicated a prep-session with Mr. Hamm and Ms. Mozingo before the meeting will be helpful. Ms. Mozingo stated a prep-session can be arranged.

Ms. Mozingo pointed out she anticipates meeting with the Congressional Delegation to introduce the City’s new Federal Action Plan, have the plan approved, and get in line early for priority items.
Mayor Alexander asked for the dates of the goal setting retreat. Ms. Baker indicated the retreat will take place virtually on February 10, 2021 from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. and on February 11, 2021 from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Mayor Alexander indicated one goal of the retreat is to identify the City’s top three to five priorities. Ms. Mozingo stated she can participate in the retreat if necessary.

RECESS

By consensus, Council agreed to take a five-minute recess. The meeting reconvened at 7:45 p.m.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG-CV) FUNDING

Housing Planner Candace Edwards indicated the first phase of the Draft Action Plan Amendment ended following the closing of the public comment period on January 12, 2021. She added the second phase is to review staff recommendations and request approval from Council.

Ms. Edwards reviewed previously discussed staff recommendations and changes that were made to the Draft Action Plan Amendment:

- Public Service $50,555
- Small Businesses $60,000
- Homelessness Prevention Coordination $40,000
- Emergency Sewer and Lateral Assistance $10,000
- Rent and Utility Assistance $75,000

Ms. Edwards indicated the total amount of funds include an expected second allocation of $200,221 and the left over balance from the first allocation of $34,834.

Ms. Edwards stated there are public service agencies in the City that are providing excellent rent and utility assistance. She explained there is expected to be numerous applications for assistance due to the moratorium being lifted after January 31, 2021.

Mayor Alexander asked if the allocation process was inclusive of the public comments. Ms. Edwards indicated all comments received during the public comment period were considered when recommendations for allocation amounts were designated.

Councilmember Post asked if the $75,000 allocated for rent and utility assistance will be lost if the moratorium is extended. Ms. Edwards indicated the City has 36 months to spend the money and an extension of the moratorium should not be a problem.

Ms. Edwards stated if the amendment is adopted, there would be an application phase from January 20, 2021 to February 19, 2021 giving entities an opportunity to apply for the funds.
Thereupon, Councilmember Miller made a motion to adopt an amendment to the FY2020-2021 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Action Plan regarding the use of use of CDBG funding to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the Coronavirus (CDBG-CV) through the CARES Act. Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted AYE, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (4-0)

LAND DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT MAP AMENDMENT- Z-01-2020

Senior Planner Catherine Garner addressed Council regarding Land Development District Map Amendment Z-01-2020 to rezone one parcel on the south side of South Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue from Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX) and Highway Business (HB) to HB. She explained the request is to clean up a split-zoning, and she noted HB will better meet the applicant’s needs for the proposed development. She added the unnumbered parcel will be given an address when construction documents are received. She stated the parcel is approximately 255 feet south of the intersection of South Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue and Mooresville Road.

Ms. Garner noted the Planning Board considered the request at its December 8, 2020 meeting and recommended unanimous approval. She pointed out Council held a public hearing on January 5, 2021, and she added no additional comments or questions have been received.

Councilmember Miller stated the City Council hereby finds and determines that adoption of an Ordinance to rezone the property described herein, as requested, is not inconsistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan due to the proposed petition, site characteristics, surrounding development pattern, and observations provided by City planning staff, identifying there are no policies in direct opposition to the petition. Thereupon, Mr. Miller made a motion to adopt an Ordinance amending the Land Development District Map of the City of Salisbury, North Carolina rezoning 8.24 acres known as Parcel ID 060 190 from Highway Business (HB) and Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX) to Highway Business (HB). Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted AYE, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (4-0)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT MAP OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA REZONING 8.24 ACRES KNOWN AS PARCEL ID 060 190 FROM HIGHWAY BUSINESS (HB) AND CORRIDOR MIXED-USE (CMX) TO HIGHWAY BUSINESS (HB). (PETITION NO. Z-01-2020)

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 29 at Page No. 46, and is known as Ordinance 2021-05.)

LAND DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT MAP AMENDMENT- Z-02-2020

Senior Planner Catherine Garner addressed Council regarding Land Development District Map Amendment Z-02-2020 to rezone one parcel located at 725 South Main Street from Highway Business (HB) to Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX). She reviewed the request, and she pointed out the
site is developed with one house-type building recently used as commercial space.

Ms. Garner noted at its last meeting Council requested additional information regarding HB zoning and how it relates to residential uses. She stated the zoning districts in the Land Development Ordinance (LDO) are organized on the transect model and lower numbers are rural areas and higher numbers are urban areas. She explained the LDO addresses special districts that make allowance for auto dependent activities such as big-box retail or institutional campuses and industrial zones.

Ms. Garner explained HB zoning is defined as the intensity of commercial development in the zoning district and is established by the traffic of the fronting thoroughfare to facilitate convenient access, minimize traffic congestion, and to reduce the visual impact of excessive signage and parking lots. She pointed out HB zoning is found along Jake Alexander Boulevard, portions of South Main Street, and along Faith and Julian Roads. She noted HB zoning is intended for areas of auto oriented uses of greater intensity such as Walmart.

Ms. Garner stated CMX areas are coded to facilitate convenient access to minimize traffic congestion and reduce the visual impact of auto oriented uses along the City’s major thoroughfares. She indicated developments in CMX zoning should be traditionally detailed and encourage pedestrian use through connections to adjacent neighborhoods and the construction of mixed-use buildings. She displayed a map of the area, and she pointed out the parcel and its proximity to Neighborhood Mixed-Use (NMX), Civic and Institutional (CI), HB, Downtown Mixed-Use (DMX), and CMX zonings. She pointed out discussion took place at the last Council meeting regarding this section of South Main Street. She explained HB zoning in the area may be a misapplied carry-over from the adoption of the LDO in 2008. She noted multi-family uses are permitted in CMX and HB zonings. She added the residential uses in HB zoning are anticipated to be apartment complexes with multiple residential units verses single-family residential lots that are permitted in CMX zoning.

Mayor Alexander pointed out it makes more sense for the area to be zoned CMX or DMX. She asked if in the future staff can speak with landowners in the other areas to determine the needs of the community. Ms. Garner noted staff did not want to rezone an entire corridor of 27 properties without having a chance to determine if CMX or DMX zoning is a better fit for the area.

Councilmember Post stated he has concerns regarding spot zoning, and he asked if staff is planning to reach out to the entire neighborhood regarding zoning in the area. Ms. Garner noted a study of the corridor needs to be conducted, and she commented staff is not sure when the study will need to be completed in regards to the Comprehensive Plan. She explained the application needs to be considered, but staff wants to be intentional and make the right decision for the entire area.

Councilmember Miller pointed out there are under-developed properties in this area on South Main Street. He explained he would like the study to start where the CMX zoning begins south of Monroe Street and ending at Stallings Memorial Baptist Church. He added he understands the petitioner’s request, and it is within the petitioner’s right to ask. He added he has an easier time putting the property in a DMX zoning because DMX is two or three parcels away. He noted
new development would have to behave like DMX zoning regarding intensity and setback. He stated he prefers DMX zoning for the area and it would accomplish the property owner’s intent.

Councilmember Sheffield pointed out the applicant’s goal is a multi-family dwelling. Ms. Garner clarified the applicant wanted the option of either single-family or multi-family development and DMX would provide both options. She pointed out DMX and CMX zonings are very similar. Mayor Alexander indicated DMX zoning includes the Conditional District (CD) Overlay process which provides flexibility.

Councilmember Sheffield pointed out the applicant’s goal is a multi-family dwelling. Ms. Garner clarified the applicant wanted the option of either single-family or multi-family development and DMX would provide both options. She pointed out DMX and CMX zonings are very similar. Mayor Alexander indicated DMX zoning includes the Conditional District (CD) Overlay process which provides flexibility.

Councilmember Post suggested completing a study of the area along the eastern side of South Main Street. Mayor Alexander pointed out if Council is considering changing HB zoning then DMX or CMX zoning should be considered. She commented changing the zoning from CMX to DMX would provide the applicant everything that was requested. She noted it is important not to make the applicant wait for a study to be conducted. Ms. Garner pointed out with DMX zoning the house building type is not a permitted building type. She clarified an existing building can stay, but it becomes a legal nonconforming structure that could not be added on to. She noted completing a study in three or four months would be difficult for staff, and she added it is a priority of the Comprehensive Plan to examine some of the small area plans.

Planning Director Hannah Jacobson noted the Planning Department is extremely short staffed and at capacity with its current workload. She added priorities could be shifted to complete the study within six months.

Councilmember Sheffield questioned if Council decides to rezone the property as CMX how it would impact future zoning in the area and what the consequences would be for the property owner. Mr. Miller noted there are approximately six different uses between CMX and DMX zoning and one or two would require a CD Overlay or a Special Use Permit (SUP). He stated the uses are similar and the biggest difference is the house type which would create nonconformity.

Ms. Jacobson explained if the property were zoned DMX the structure would become legal nonconforming. She added as long as the use is a single-family unit it could remain legal nonconforming. Mayor Alexander pointed out CMX zoning provides flexibility for residential or commercial use without creating a nonconformity. She indicated from an urban design standpoint CMX would be more appropriate. She noted DMX is for downtown, and she commented it is more dense and allows property near the street.

Ms. Jacobson noted all aspects of the LDO needs to be considered for a study of the corridor. Ms. Garner pointed out CMX zoning has more flexible setbacks than DMX zoning. She noted the applicant’s house building type is permitted under CMX and would not create a legal nonconforming building type. Mayor Alexander noted more properties would be nonconforming if the area was zoned DMX.

Councilmember Miller clarified there might be some interest in a multi-family project in the area, and he noted DMX makes sense in regards to the future development pattern. Mayor Alexander agreed it would be desirable for new multi-family development to be up to the street. She pointed out Council must make a decision based on the application for CMX zoning at 725
Councilmember Miller questioned if spot zoning would become an issue if someone were to challenge it. City Attorney Graham Corriher explained this is a defensible case that would not be classified as spot zoning. He explained spot zoning is a legal term and in a legislative decision the Council must show it made a reasonable decision. He stated Council has had a robust discussion and the decision it makes is defensible.

Councilmember Miller stated he is comfortable moving forward with the request before Council. He noted the zoning in the area needs to be addressed in a future study and the property owner needs to be made aware of another possible zoning change once the study occurs. Mayor Alexander indicated a study would help determine where DMX zoning would end and CMX would begin.

Councilmember Sheffield stated the City Council hereby finds and determines that adoption of an Ordinance to rezone the property described herein, as requested, is not inconsistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan due to the proposed petition, site characteristics, surrounding development pattern, and observations provided by City planning staff, identifying there are no policies in direct opposition to the petition. Thereupon, Ms. Sheffield made a motion to adopt an Ordinance amending the Land Development District Map of the City of Salisbury, North Carolina rezoning 0.56 acres of 725 South Main Street (Parcel ID 015 537) from Highway Business (HB) to Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX). Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted NAY, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (3-1)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT MAP OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA REZONING 0.56 ACRES OF 725 SOUTH MAIN STREET (PARCEL ID 015 537) FROM HIGHWAY BUSINESS (HB) TO CORRIDOR MIXED-USE (CMX). (PETITION NO. Z-02-2020)

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 29 at Page No. 47, and is known as Ordinance 2021-06.)

Mayor Alexander asked if a motion or directive is needed to advise Planning Department staff to take on the discussed small area plan. City Manager Lane Bailey noted staff has heard Council’s concerns and will begin the study as soon as it can manage the project. Mayor Alexander thanked staff for its presentation.

CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT

City Attorney Graham Corriher had nothing to report to Council.

CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

City Manager Lane Bailey had nothing to report to Council.
COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Sheffield suggested Council consider a motion regarding the Historic Landmark Ordinance. Mayor Alexander stated she spoke with City Clerk Kelly Baker who noted if Council wanted to place the item on the next Agenda a public notice would be required. City Attorney Graham Corriher recommended making a motion to hold a public hearing at the next Council meeting and to consider a moratorium.

Thereupon, Councilmember Sheffield made a motion to hold a public hearing to consider a moratorium regarding the City’s Local Historic Landmark Ordinance. Upon a roll call vote Mayor Alexander voted AYE, Councilmember Miller voted AYE, Councilmember Post voted AYE, and Councilmember Sheffield voted AYE. (4-0)

Councilmember Sheffield noted many events took place throughout the weekend in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. She noted the Human Relations Council (HRC) adopted Kelsey Scott Park and will take care the park in the future.

Councilmember Sheffield noted Boards and Commission terms expire in March, and she encouraged citizens who may be interested in serving to apply.

Councilmember Post thanked staff for all they do for the City. He stated he is concerned about spot zoning. He noted based on Council’s conversation staff will bring a recommendation to Council that could involve a rezoning for the entire area, and he would prefer the rezoning take place before the spot zoning.

MAYOR PRO TEM COMMENT

Mayor Pro Tem Heggins was not in attendance.

MAYOR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMENTS

Mayor Alexander announced the following events:

(a) Downtown Main Street Plan

The public is invited to provide feedback on the proposed Downtown Main Street Plan. The plan will be presented virtually to the Neighborhood Leaders Alliance on January 21, 2021 at 4:00 p.m. and at a Main Street meeting January 27, 2021 at 6:00 p.m. Meetings will be held outdoors and in person on January 22, 2021 at 8:00 a.m. in front of Koco Java located at 329 North Main Street, and January 22, 2021 at 11:30 a.m. in front of the Wells Fargo Building located at 130 South Main Street. For Zoom meeting links and to view the draft plan please visit www.salisburync.gov/mainstplan.
(b) COVID-19 Vaccine Drive-thru Clinic

Rowan County Public Health has issued a media release indicating they will host a COVID-19 vaccine drive-thru clinic. The clinic will be held on Wednesday, January 20th at West End Plaza, 1935 Jake Alexander Boulevard and will take place from 9:30 a.m. until 3:30 p.m. or as long as the vaccine supply allows. The clinic will be for individuals that fall into Group 1 (healthcare workers fighting COVID-19 and long-term care staff and residents) or Group 2 (individuals 65 years or older). For your safety, individuals will not be allowed to enter the parking area before 6:00 a.m.

(c) Kiva Loan Program

Mayor Alexander announced she heard from Concord Mayor William Dusch, Kannapolis Mayor Darrell Hinnant, and Statesville Mayor Costi Kutteh who were invited to partner with the City regarding the KIVA Loan Program. She noted the partnership will help reduce the cost regarding KIVA and will assist with building equity in the community.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Councilmember Miller. All Council members in attendance agreed unanimously to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

___________________________________
Karen Alexander, Mayor

____________________________________
Kelly Baker, City Clerk
SALISBURY, North Carolina
October 20, 2020

SPECIAL MEETING

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

ABSENT: City Manager W. Lane Bailey

In response to the State of Emergency declaration related to the spread of COVID-19 and to limit physical interactions and the potential spread of COVID-19 the Salisbury City Council met electronically. The meeting was called to order by Mayor Alexander at 5:00 p.m. A moment of silence was taken.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

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

CLOSED SESSION

Thereupon, Councilmember Post made a motion to go into closed session regarding an economic development matter as allowed by NCGS 143-318.11(a)(4).
RETURN TO OPEN SESSION

Mayor Alexander reconvened the meeting in open session. She noted no action was taken during closed session.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Councilmember Sheffield. All Council members in attendance agreed by roll call vote to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

________________________
Karen Alexander, Mayor

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

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

Requested Council Meeting Date:  February 2, 2021

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

Name of Presenter(s):  Dana Ruth, Engineer

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

Description of Requested Agenda Item:  Spectrum requests approval of installation of directional bore duct within the City Rights-of-Way, at the 200 Block of W Council St. City Council approval of encroachments is required by Section 11-24 (27) of the City Code.

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

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

Attachments:  ☑ Yes  ☐ No

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

There is no budgetary impact on this item.

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item:  (Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)
City Council to consider approval of a right-of-way encroachment by Spectrum in the 200 Block of W Council Street per Section 11-24 (27) of the City Code.

Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Dana Ruth – 704-638-2176

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

☐ Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)
FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

________________________________________  ______________________________________
Finance Manager Signature                  Department Head Signature

________________________________________
Budget Manager Signature

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

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved          ☐ Delayed          ☐ Declined

Reason:
SCOPE OF WORK

LOCATION. 120 N Church St Salisbury NC 28144

PURPOSE: TO PROVIDE TENANT ACCESS TO SPECTRUM BUSINESS PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

This document outlines the basic scope of work as we intend to install Spectrum Business service to 120 N Church St. The overall project will consist of the installation of fiber to the building. The services will be brought to the building through a new directionally bored 2" conduit. This conduit will be directionally bored from the tie point as noted on attached map. It is our intention to install this system in accordance with any and all applicable codes and regulations.
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

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

Requested Council Meeting Date:  02/02/2021

Name of Group(s) or Individual(s) Making Request:  Wendy Brindle, Engineering Director

Name of Presenter(s):  Wendy Brindle

Requested Agenda Item:  The consideration to amend Chapter 13, Article X of the City Code of Ordinances as it relates to parking restrictions.

Description of Requested Agenda Item:  The Newsome Road widening project is now complete. This project added sidewalks and bike lanes to the roadway from Bringle Ferry Road to Stokes Ferry Road. The new cross-section design does not allow for on-street parking. The small portion of Newsome Rd between Stokes Ferry Road and East Innes Street also does not have a cross-section which will allow on-street parking. Staff is recommending a change to Section 13-338 (Parking prohibited at all times) for the entire extent of Newsome Road.

Attachments:  ☒ Yes  □ No

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

There is no budgetary impact on this item.

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item:  (Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition) City Council to adopt the attached Ordinance amending Section 13-338 parking prohibited at all times.

Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Vickie Eddleman – 704-638-5213

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

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

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

Finance Manager Signature

Department Head Signature

Budget Manager Signature

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

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved         ☐ Delayed         ☐ Declined

Reason:
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 13, ARTICLE X, OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, RELATING TO PARKING

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

SECTION 1. That Section 13-338, Article X, Chapter 13 of the Code of the City of Salisbury be amended to add the underlined or to delete the stricken language as follows:

Sec. 13-338. Parking prohibited at all times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsome Rd.</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Entire extent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

SECTION 3. That this Ordinance shall be effective upon adoption by the City of Salisbury from and after is passage.
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Select Submission Category:</th>
<th>[ ] Public</th>
<th>[ ] Council</th>
<th>[ ] Manager</th>
<th>[x] Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Requested Council Meeting Date: February 2, 2021

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

Name of Presenter(s): Catherine Garner

Requested Agenda Item: Council to consider adopting an ordinance establishing a moratorium pursuant to NC General Statutes 160A-381(e) on the City Council’s consideration and approval of Historic Landmarks.

Description of Requested Agenda Item: Council to consider adopting an ordinance establishing a moratorium pursuant to NC General Statutes 160A-381(e) on the City Council’s consideration and approval of Historic Landmarks. If adopted, the proposed moratorium would remain in effect for (6) months.

Attachments: [ ] Yes | [x] No

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

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item: Council to hold a public hearing and consider adopting an ordinance establishing the moratorium as proposed. *(Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)*

Contact Information for Group or Individual: Catherine Garner, x5212, catherine.garner@salisburync.gov

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

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

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________                  ______________________________
Finance Manager Signature                  Department Head Signature

_________________________________
Budget Manager Signature

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

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

☐ Approved  ☐ Delayed  ☐ Declined

Reason:
AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A SIX MONTH MORATORIUM FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS IN THE CITY OF SALISBURY

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

Section 1. The City Council acknowledges and embraces the importance of historic preservation in the City of Salisbury. The City has been and remains a leader in historic preservation. The City Council takes very seriously its obligation to preserve historic areas and properties of the City, and desires that its historic preservation programs be and remain robust and fair.

Section 2. In accordance with this dedication to historic preservation, in 2017, the City Council adopted an ordinance establishing a program to designate Local Historic Landmarks (“Landmark” or “Landmark Property” and the “Landmark Ordinance” or the “Landmark Program”). The Landmark Program lacked guidance beyond that established by State law as to what constitutes a Landmark Property. The City Council desires that more specific goals, objectives, standards, and procedures be developed by City staff, in coordination with the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), for the Landmark Program.

Section 3. A temporary moratorium on considering applications under the Landmark Program is necessary to allow City staff and the HPC to adequately review and revise the Landmark Program. Without this moratorium, applications submitted to the City would be reviewed under the existing Landmark Program, which City Council has determined to be inadequate.

Section 4. The moratorium will affect the HPC’s review of Landmark pre-applications and applications, as well as the City Council’s consideration and approval of Landmark applications.

Section 5. The moratorium will remain in effect for six (6) months from the date of the adoption of this Ordinance. This duration is reasonably necessary to allow time to develop goals and objectives for the Landmark Program, to facilitate a community conversation regarding the goals of the Program, and to revise the City’s Land Development Ordinance and any other policies to reflect the required changes to the Landmark Program.

Section 6. In the course of the next six (6) months, the HPC shall propose revisions to the City’s Landmark Program. Once these proposed revisions are in place, conversations with community stakeholders will be facilitated to receive additional feedback. When that is completed, the proposed revisions will be submitted to the City Council for consideration in accordance with the procedures required by City ordinances and other applicable law.

Section 7. All ordinances, or the parts of ordinances in conflict with this Ordinance, are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

Section 8. This Ordinance shall be effective upon adoption by the City of Salisbury from and after is passage.
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

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

Requested Council Meeting Date: 02/02/2021

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

Name of Presenter(s): Catherine Garner

Requested Agenda Item: Z-03-2020 – 417, 421, 425 Faith Road, 112 Dunham Avenue, Parcel ID 070 012

Description of Requested Agenda Item: Z-03-2020: Request to rezone one (1) parcel at 417, 421, 425 Faith Road, 112 Dunham Avenue (PID 070 012) from Urban Residential (UR8) and Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX) to Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX).

Attachments: □ Yes □ No

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

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

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

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

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

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________   _____________________________
Finance Manager Signature     Department Head Signature

_________________________________
Budget Manager Signature

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

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only
FILING DATE: 12-07-2020
CASE #: Z-03-2020

GENERAL REZONING
FEES PER CITY OF SALISBURY BUDGET ORDINANCE
$600

PETITION TYPE

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

EXISTING DISTRICT(S): CMX, UR8
PROPOSED DISTRICT(S): CMX

GENERAL PROPERTY DESCRIPTION (ESPECIALLY IF UNADDRESSED)

Proposed Retail Building and Parking for Goodwill Store.

PROPERTY & CONTACT INFORMATION

Rowan County Parcel ID(s): 070011, 070012
Address or Site Location: 418 Faith Road and 417 Faith Road in Salisbury, NC
Subdivision: N/A
Lot(s): N/A
Petitioner: Goodwill Industries International Inc. (Attn. Bill Haymore)
Address: PO Box 4299 2701 University Parkway Winston-Salem, NC 27115
Email: bhaymore@goodwillnc.org
Best Phone: 336-724-3621 x1206
Owner (if different than petitioner):
Address:
Email:

SIGNATURE

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

Petitioner (or representative): [Signature]
DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

INITIAL PLANNING BOARD DATE: ___/___/20___

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

- DATE OF INITIAL COMMITTEE MEETING: ___/___/20___
- DATE OF ADDITIONAL MEETINGS: ___/___/20___
- COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION?

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

 INITIAL CITY COUNCIL DATE: ___/___/20___

- IF SENT TO COUNCIL COMMITTEE
  - COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

- DATE OF INITIAL COMMITTEE MEETING: ___/___/20___
- DATE OF ADDITIONAL MEETINGS: ___/___/20___
- COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION?

- CITY COUNCIL STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY & REASONABLENESS:

- DECISION:
  - DATE OF DECISION: ___/___/20___
  - VOTE: (_______)
  - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR FILE:

Application Last Revised: JAN 2019
# Zoning Permit Application

**Filing Date:**

**Case #:**

**Plan Review Case # (If Applicable):**

## Building Information

- New Principal Building
- Addition
- Remodel/Upfit
- Accessory Structure

**Existing SqFt:** N/A

**Proposed SqFt:** 11,500

## Development Type

- House (<5 units)
- MF (<8 units)
- MF (≥8 units)
- Non-Residential (<10,000 sq)
- Non-Residential (≥10,000 sq)
- Floodplain/Watershed
- Parking Lot—Primary Use

## Use Information

- New/Added Use
- Change of Use
- No Change of Use
- (Existing use remains)
- Home Occupation
- Temporary Use

## Project Description

- N/A

**Total Projected Cost:**

## Plan Submittal Attachments

- Site
- Floor
- Elevation
- Landscape

## Property & Contact Information

**Rowan County Parcel ID(s):** 070011, 070012

**Address or Site Location:** 417 Faith Road and 418 Faith Road in Salisbury, NC

**Subdivision:** N/A

**Lot(s):** N/A

**Applicant:** Goodwill Industries International Inc. (Attn. Bill Haymore)

**Address:** PO Box 4299 2701 University Parkway Winston-Salem, NC 27115

**Email:** bhaymore@goodwillnwnc.org

**Best Phone:** 336-724-3631 x1206

**Owner (If different than applicant):**

**Address:**

**Email:**

**Daytime Phone:**

## Signature

I certify that all information provided on this application is accurate and that all work will be performed to meet the laws of the State of North Carolina, the standards of the Salisbury Land Development Ordinance, and the City of Salisbury Uniform Construction Standards Manual. Submission of this application does not constitute a granting of approval or issuance of a permit. The City of Salisbury reserves the right to request additional information to ensure complete review.

Applicant: [Signature]

**Application Last Revised:** MARCH, 2020

* See back of page for utility connection status
UTILITY CONNECTIONS

Water: Existing √ PUBLIC or □ PRIVATE connection with no change to service
Proposed √ NEW or □ REPLACEMENT connection @ _________ (size in inches)

Sewer: Existing √ PUBLIC or □ PRIVATE connection with no change to service
Proposed □ NEW or □ REPLACEMENT connection @ _________ (size in inches)

Irrigation: Existing □ PUBLIC or □ PRIVATE connection with no change to service
Proposed □ NEW or □ REPLACEMENT connection @ _________ (size in inches)

Fire: Existing □ PUBLIC or □ PRIVATE connection with no change to service
Proposed □ NEW or □ REPLACEMENT connection @ _________ (size in inches)

F.O.G.: □ New □ Replace >>> □ Trap □ In-ground Interceptor

Backflow: □ New □ Replace □ Upgrade _________ (size in inches)

DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

Project Title:

Zoning: _______ Overlay: _______ Local Historic Overlay? □ Yes □ No

Present Use:

Number, type, and condition of any existing structures:

List any known nonconformities:

Does the project require issuance of an NCDOT driveway permit? □ Yes □ No

Does the overall project generate 3,000+ vpd during an average weekday? (Sec. 4.14) □ Yes □ No

Will the project provide outdoor lighting on private property? (Ch. 11) □ Yes □ No

Will the project require outdoor storage? (Sec. 6.9) □ Yes □ No

Does a sidewalk exist along the street side parcel lines? (Sec. 4.4) □ Partial □ Yes □ No

Requesting Payment In Lieu of Mitigation based on the TIA? (Sec. 4.14) □ Yes □ No

Requesting Payment In Lieu of Recreational Open Space Allocation? (Sec. 7.6) □ Yes □ No

Requesting Payment In Lieu of Sidewalk? (Sec. 4.9) □ Yes □ No

Property Size (gross area in acres): _______ Area of Disturbance (acres): _______

Other & Notes:
November 30, 2020

RE: Goodwill CMX Rezoning

Dear Neighbor:

Goodwill has filed a request with the City of Salisbury seeking to rezone approximately +/-1.71 acres from CMX & UR-8 to CMX - “Goodwill CMX Rezoning” in order to accommodate their plans to develop a proposed retail building and parking for a Goodwill store.

The City of Salisbury and Rowan County Tax Assessor’s office records indicate that you are an owner of property that adjoins, is located across the street, or is near the site (within 250’ feet of the site’s proposed boundary). The subject site is described by Rowan County Tax Parcels 070 011 and 070 012.

Please find attached the Goodwill CMX Rezoning Site Plan.

Due to COVID related restrictions, in lieu of an in-person community meeting we have provided contact information for project representatives. Should you have any questions or need additional information about this new retail building and parking for a Goodwill store, please do not hesitate to contact the individuals below:

Contact Information:
Matthew Mandle
ESP Associates, Inc.
mmandle@espassociates.com
704.269.4483

Skylar White
ESP Associates, Inc.
swwhite@espassociates.com
803.835.0905

Thank you in advance for your interest and participation. We look forward to sharing more information about this retail space with you.

Cordially,

Bill Haymore
Goodwill Industries International Inc.
CASE NO. Z-03-2020

Petitioner(s) Goodwill Industries of NW North Carolina

Owner(s) Same

Representative(s) Bill Haymore

Address 417 – 425 Faith Road; 112 Dunham Avenue

Tax Map & Parcel(s) 070 011, 070 012

Size / Scope Approximately 1.77 acres encompassing two (2) parcels

Location Parcels are located on the west side of Faith Road at the corner of Faith Road and Dunham Avenue.

PETITIONER REQUEST

Request: Petition proposes request to amend the Land Development Ordinance district map by rezoning two (2) parcels, approximately 1.77 acres, from Corridor Mixed-Use (CMX) and Urban Residential (UR8) to Corridor Mixed-Use. One of the parcels is already zoned CMX (070 011); the second parcel is split zoned. The two parcels together are planned for redevelopment for a future Goodwill store.

Staff Comments: The petitioner is requesting to rezone the split-zoned parcel (070 012) from CMX and UR8 to CMX. This is consistent with the adjacent parcel under common ownership (070 011) as well as other parcels in the Faith Road corridor. This request is not a Conditional District rezoning request; thus, if approved, all development would have to conform to the requirements of the CMX zoning district as adopted.

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

CHARACTER OF AREA

Overview: Both parcels are currently developed. The smaller parcel (070 011) has a single residential structure; the larger parcel (070 012) has multiple structures, including two commercial
structures and two residential structures. Residential development surrounds the parcel on the west along Dunham Avenue. The Faith Road corridor is completely commercial. The parcel abuts Innes Street Market shopping center to the north, Aldi grocery store to the east, and smaller commercial operations in converted houses to the south.

Existing uses in the surrounding vicinity include retail, professional services, governmental services, and single family residential.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Land Uses</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North of area</td>
<td>Commercial, including Innes Street Market</td>
<td>HB, CMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of area</td>
<td>Commercial, Government Services</td>
<td>CMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of area</td>
<td>Commercial, Residential</td>
<td>CMX, UR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of area</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>UR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### INFRASTRUCTURE & CIVIC/COMMUNITY FACILITIES

**Public Schools:**
- Elementary: Granite Quarry
- Middle: Erwin / Henderson
- High: East Rowan / Henderson

**Fire District:**
- Station 1

**Utilities**
- Water & Sewer:
  - Public water and sewer are available within the Faith Road and Dunham Avenue right-of-ways (ROWs). Changes to any existing services would be reviewed and approved during construction document review.

**Transportation**
- Transit:
  - This site is not currently served by Salisbury Public Transit.
- Property Access(s):
  - Currently, the parcels have access on Dunham Avenue and Faith Road. During redevelopment, the City will review access as part of the site plan review. The applicants will have
### Planning & Zoning Analysis

**Public Improvements:**

Faith Road is a NCDOT maintained road. Dunham Avenue is a city street.

---

### ENVIRONMENT

**Topography / Hydrology:**

The parcels are very even and flat. Faith Road and Dunham Avenue sit at grade for both of these parcels. There appears to be only one mature tree on site close to Faith Road, otherwise the site has little existing vegetation.

**Flood Hazard / Streams / Wetlands:**

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

---

### COMPREHENSIVE & AREA PLANS

**Applicable Plans:**

**Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan**

The City shall encourage appropriate landscaping and reconfiguration of large, unlandscaped parking areas. Landscaped pedestrian walkways from car to store or across a parking area shall be encouraged.

**Policy C-16:**

Commercial or other development that would jeopardize the public health, safety, and welfare of an existing residential neighborhood shall not be permitted. … Further, businesses may be approved adjoining (and therefore convenient to) an existing residential area, when such businesses can be shown to clearly satisfy design considerations similar to a newly planned, pedestrian scaled, mixed-use development.

**Policy C-17:**

Large-scale commercial uses shall be located on the corners of neighborhood planning areas.

---

### PLANNING BOARD

**Recommendation:**

This proposal was presented to Planning Board at their courtesy hearing on January 12, 2021. The Planning Board heard from Bill Haymore of Goodwill Industries as the applicant and Matt Mandle from ESP Associates as the agent. No one attended to speak regarding the application. After deliberation, the Planning Board unanimously of members present to recommend approval, stating the proposal is consistent with Vision 2020.
Z-03-2020:
417 – 425 Faith Road
& 112 Dunham Avenue
PIDs 070 011, 070 112
Goodwill Industries – owner/applicant

Request

• Rezone one (1) parcel from Urban Residential (UR8) and Corridor Mixed Use (CMX) to Corridor Mixed Use (CMX)
  • One parcel is already zoned CMX; included for transparency

• Site is currently developed with several buildings
  • House building types; some residential and some converted for office use
## Use Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASE DISTRICT</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>Assigned District</th>
<th>Planned Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Unit Family</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex, Semi-Detached</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 single-family homes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Through Commercial</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Apartment</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care Home</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge Site for the Elderly</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Care</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV Park and Manufactured Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail, Food, Financial Services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Early Learning</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Life Care Centers</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Organizations</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Unit Services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Care Facility (Non-Retail Residential)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **T1, T2, T3, T4, T5**: Categories of use.
- **Assigned District**: District assignments.
- **Planned Development**: Development plans.
## Use Matrix

### Office / Service (cont.)

| BASE DISTRICT | OSP | BR  | GR  | UR  | HR  | BMX | NM  | CMX | CMX | HM  | LI  | HI  | HS  | CI  | MHD | TND |
|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| **Office**    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **Retail**    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **Entertainment / Recreation** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **Healthcare** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **Education** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **Transportation / Infrastructure** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

### Use Matrix (continued)

| BASE DISTRICT | OSP | BR  | GR  | UR  | HR  | BMX | NM  | CMX | CMX | HM  | LI  | HI  | HS  | CI  | MHD | TND |
|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| **Office**    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **Retail**    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **Entertainment / Recreation** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **Healthcare** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **Education** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **Transportation / Infrastructure** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
Applicable Vision Statements

• **Policy C-8**: The City shall encourage appropriate landscaping and reconfiguration of large, unlandscaped parking areas. Landscaped pedestrian walkways from car to store or across a parking area shall be encouraged.

• **Policy C-16**: Commercial or other development that would jeopardize the public health, safety, and welfare of an existing residential neighborhood shall not be permitted. ... Further, businesses may be approved adjoining (and therefore convenient to) an existing residential area, when such businesses can be shown to clearly satisfy design considerations similar to a newly planned, pedestrian-scaled, mixed-use development.

• **Policy C-17**: Large-scale commercial uses shall be located on the corners of neighborhood planning areas.

Planning Board Recommendation

Planning Board met on December 8, 2020 and voted unanimously of those present to recommend approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstention</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jayne Land</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jon Post</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tim Norris</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. PJ Ricks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Schaffer, Chairman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bill Wagoner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Struzick, Vice-Chairman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dennis Rogers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bill Burgin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salisbury City Council
Statement of Consistency & Zoning Recommendation

DISTRICT MAP AMENDMENT: Z-03-2020
Project Title: Z-03-2020
Petitioner(s): Goodwill Industries of Northwest North Carolina
Owner(s): Goodwill Industries of Northwest North Carolina
Representative(s) or Developer(s) Bill Haymore, Goodwill Industries; Matt Mandle, ESP Associates
Tax Map - Parcel(s): 070 012
Size / Scope: Approximately 1.46 acres encompassing one (1) parcel
Location: Parcel is located on the west side of Faith Road at the intersection of Faith Road and Dunham Avenue encompassing the addresses 417, 421, 425 Faith Road and 112 Dunham Avenue.

REQUEST:
Request to amend the Land Development District Map by rezoning one (1) parcel at 417, 421, 425 FAITH ROAD AND 112 DUNHAM AVENUE (PID 070 012) from ‘URBAN RESIDENTIAL (UR8)’ AND ‘CORRIDOR MIXED USE (CMX)’ to ‘CORRIDOR MIXED USE (CMX)’

STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY & RECOMMENDATION:
The Salisbury City Council held a public hearing and reviewed the petition on February 2, 2021. The Council finds that the rezoning petition of the aforementioned parcels are NOT INCONSISTENT with the Salisbury Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan, is reasonable, and in the public interest because:

This specific rezoning action is not inconsistent of the comprehensive plan nor violates the goals, objectives, or policies of the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan.
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT MAP OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, REZONING 1.46 ACRES OF 417, 421, 425 FAITH ROAD AND 112 DUNHAM AVENUE (PARCEL ID 070 012) FROM URBAN RESIDENTIAL (UR8) AND CORRIDOR MIXED USE (CMX) TO CORRIDOR MIXED USE (CMX). (PETITION NO. Z-03-2020)

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

WHEREAS, the Salisbury Planning Board, an advisory board to the Salisbury City Council, reviewed the rezoning petition on January 12, 2021, unanimously voted to recommend approval as submitted, and stated that the request is consistent with the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a properly-noticed public hearing at the regularly-scheduled City Council meeting of February 2, 2021; and

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

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

SECTION 1. That properties identified in the City of Salisbury and Rowan County as Tax Map 070 Parcel(s) 012 including those abutting rights-of-way and reaching to the respective centerlines, as designated on the official property identification maps of Rowan County, is hereby rezoned to ‘CMX’ district.

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

SECTION 3. That this Ordinance shall be effective from and after its passage.
Requested Agenda Item: Council to consider adoption of an ordinance designating the “Moore House,” located at 124 S Ellis Street in Salisbury, North Carolina, as a Local Historic Landmark.

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

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

The Moore House is a contributing structure to the Salisbury Historic District (West Square Local Historic District). If approved, this would be the sixth LHL and the third LHL within a National Register district. Council held a public hearing on January 19, 2021. Additional comments received have been forwarded to Council.

Attachments: ☑ Yes ☐ No

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

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

Council to consider adoption of an ordinance designating the “Moore House,” located at 124 S Ellis Street in Salisbury, North Carolina, as a Local Historic Landmark.

Contact Information for Group or Individual: Catherine Garner, catherine.garner@salisburync.gov; 704-638-5212
☐ Consent Agenda (item requires no discussion and will be voted on by Council or removed from the consent agenda to the regular agenda)

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

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________   _____________________________  
Finance Manager Signature     Department Head Signature

______________________________  
Budget Manager Signature

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

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved       ☐ Delayed       ☐ Declined

Reason:
Case #: HL-02-2019
Case Staff: Catherine Garner

Owner(s): Robert Lambrecht and Jon Planovsky
Applicant(s): Same
Authorized Agent(s): Pete Prunkl

LOCATION
District: Salisbury Historic District (National Register) / West Square (Local Historic District)
Building: Moore House
Street: 124 S Ellis Street
Tax Parcel #: 010 014

BUILDING DESCRIPTION:
Classification: Contributing
Year Built: Ca. 1893
Style: Shingle
Project Type: Local Historic Landmark Application

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF CATEGORIES A. THROUGH D. FOR LOCAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS:
Based upon the application submitted, the applicant is proposing that the Moore House is significant under Criterion B and Criterion C.

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

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

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

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

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

STAFF FINDINGS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**PRE-APPLICATION DECISION**

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

**SHPO COMMENT**

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILING DATE:</th>
<th>[ ] WITHIN A LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE NUMBER:</td>
<td>[ ] INDIVIDUALLY LISTED ON NATIONAL REGISTER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rowan County Parcel ID(s):</th>
<th>010-014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>124 South Ellis St, Salisbury NC 28144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Name of Property:</td>
<td>The Moore House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Original Construction:</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Alterations:</td>
<td>See Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register District:</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Historic District:</td>
<td>West Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually listed on National Register:</td>
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1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1: Common and Historic Name of the Property:

The Moore House

2: Physical Address:

124 South Ellis Street, Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

3: Tax Parcel Identification Number:

010-014

4: Current Owners:

Robert L. Lambrecht and Jon Planovsky

5. Current Owners Mailing Address:

124 South Ellis Street, Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

6: Appraised Value of the Property:

$335,552

2. ABSTRACT

The c. 1892 Moore House meets the qualifications of a local landmark because it was the primary residence of noted Salisbury citizen Beulah Stewart Moore (1865-1949) and because it is an outstanding example of the Shingle Style based on the design of architect F. G. S. Bryce.¹ Ms. Moore’s many contributions to both her hometown of Salisbury and the state of North Carolina are well known and documented. Her home figured prominently in her many gatherings and activities. The house itself retains all of its key Shingle Style characteristics with minimal exterior modifications since the historical period of its construction and Ms. Moore’s residence. This request for local landmark designation includes the exterior of Moore’s 3,580 sq. ft. (approximate) granite and wood house on a .536-acre lot and selected interior features. All the contemporary or relocated outbuildings are excluded from the protections afforded a local landmark.

3. HISTORIC BACKGROUND

Beulah Stewart Moore

Beulah Stewart, born in Salisbury on July 17, 1865, was the first child of John Joseph Stewart (1837-1896) and Clara Lois Bruner Stewart (1845-1927). Beulah’s maternal grandfather was John Joseph Bruner (1817-1890), the owner and editor of the Carolina Watchman (active 1832-1937), the first weekly newspaper published in Salisbury. In 1895, Miss Beulah, her preferred name, succeeded her father as editor of the Salisbury Truth (active 1887-1900) newspaper and the Carolina Watchman, becoming the third generation of her family to be a newspaper editor, a remarkable achievement for a woman at the close of the 19th century.²

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

Shingle Style and F. G. S. Bryce

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

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

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

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

Ownership

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

Modifications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. ASSESSMENT

The Moore House meets both criteria for landmark status. The person who first resided here was an important woman in Salisbury’s history and the house she built is an outstanding example of America’s Shingle style (1880-1900). The Moore House was selected as a national example of the Shingle Style (gambrel roof) in A Field Guide to American Homes. The authors called attention to the unusual cantilevered balcony over the entrance. As Shingle style houses were predominantly built in the coastal Northeast, the selection of a house from Salisbury attests to its truly representative characteristics of this style. Of the few Shingle style houses in Salisbury, the Moore House is one of the largest, truest and most untouched examples.

Over the years, several local and national organizations have focused attention on the Moore House. Historic Salisbury Foundation choose it for OctoberTour, its annual tour of historic houses, in 1981, 1988, 1996 and 2004. A photo of the Moore House was on the cover of the 2004 house tour brochure. The Laura Ashley Company selected the Moore House as one of two Salisbury houses for their 1990 Home Catalogue. Laura Ashley designers repapered the first-floor turret alcove and entrance parlor for the photo shoot and both rooms appeared in the 1990 catalogue. In 2006, the Moore House was featured in an episode of If These Walls Could Talk on the HGTV network.

5. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

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

Site

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

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

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

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

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

The first floor is a mixture of narrow clapboard on the left and right with a central uncoursed gray fieldstone turret base. On the left is a columned side porch with a low gallery and low gated entrance. All the windows on the first floor have solid window transom lights above. Next is a bow bay window formed by three single pane double hung windows with transom lights in a 4/4, 12/1 and 4/4 configuration. In the turret are two curved 4/1 single pane double hung windows with transom lights above. At the front entrance is a Romanesque arch, recessed stone porch with a 2/3 casement widow, Venetian iron hall lantern and a solid wood herringbone-style front door with hand-forged iron brackets. At the top of the arch, graduated stone corbels support a second-floor balcony. In the engaged turret are two curved 4/1 single pane double hung windows with transom lights above. Further to the right are two 4/1 single pane double hung windows with transom lights. There are three chimneys – one at center of the house, another at the south end, and a third for the kitchen. The central and kitchen chimneys were constructed with four courses of original granite at the crown followed by new red brick to the roofline. The south side chimney has an original granite crown, new red brick to the roofline and original granite from the roof to the base of the porch.

South Elevation (Side)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

North Elevation (Side)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. NEW AND NON-CONFORMING FEATURES

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

20 See Supporting Documentation numbers 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 for photographs of these interior features.
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9. Comparison of front elevation of the Bryce $5000 House with the Moore House
10. Comparison of entrance way and staircase of the Bryce $5000 House with the Moore House
11. Comparison of turret alcove and fireplace of the Bryce $5000 House with the Moore House
12. Comparison of first floor plans of the Bryce $5000 House with the Moore House
13. Comparison of second floor plans of the Bryce $5000 House with the Moore House
14. Comparison of advertisement for Venetian Iron Hall Lantern with front porch overhead lighting fixture at the Moore House
15. Two oil on canvas paintings and one drawing by Beulah Stewart Moore
16. Photo of Beulah Stewart Moore
17. Portrait painting of Elliott Daingerfield
18. The Travelers Plaque on the grounds of the Rowan Public Library (2009)
19. Pages 7 and 27, of the 1916 republished History of Rowan County, North Carolina, Miss Beulah’s bylines
20. OctoberTour brochure, October 9 and 10, 2004, cover photo of the Moore House
21. F.G. S. Bryce watercolor of the Seashore Cottage (which resembles his $5000 House)
22. The John Williams House, Hartford, Connecticut, designed by E.G.W. Dietrich
23. Example of Shingle Style Houses in Salisbury National Register Historic District
1. 1913 Sanborn Map, Salisbury, North Carolina
   with 124 South Ellis Street highlighted
2. Property lines and acreage for 124 South Ellis Street

3. Moore House during construction (1892)

4. Moore House with fence at property line (pre-1898)
5. East (Façade) Elevation—architectural drawing and circa 1900 photo
6. South Elevation—drawing and photos of the side porch

South elevation from 128 South Ellis St.

Side porch from façade elevation
7. West Elevation—drawing, circa 1895 photo and 2020 photo
7. West Elevation—drawing, circa 1895 photo and 2020 photo
8. North Elevation—drawing and contemporary photos
9. Comparison of $5000 House designed by Frederick G.S. Bryce
in the April 1892 Art Interchange Magazine
with 124 South Ellis Street, Salisbury, N.C. (2020 photo)

Initials: FGSB for architect
Frederick G. S. Bryce (1858-1893)
10. Comparison of the entranceway and staircase of the Bryce $5000 House in the April 1892 Art Interchange Magazine with photo of 124 South Ellis Street, Salisbury, N.C. (2020)
11. Comparison of turret alcove and fireplace of the Bryce $5000 House from
the April 1892 Art Interchange Magazine
with 124 South Ellis Street, Salisbury, N.C.
12. Comparison of first floor plans of the Bryce $5000 House
in the April 1892 Art Interchange Magazine
with 124 South Ellis Street, Salisbury, N.C.
13. Comparison of second floor plans of the Bryce $5000 House in the April 1892 Art Interchange Magazine with 124 South Ellis Street, Salisbury, N.C.
14. Comparison of advertisement for Venetian Iron Hall Lantern in *Art Interchange Magazine*

With front porch lighting fixture at the Moore House

Venetian Iron Hall Lantern advertised in the *Art Interchange*, 1893

Venetian Iron Hall Lantern found under the front entrance overhang at 124 South Ellis Street. There are three other similar lighting fixtures at the Moore House.
15. Two oil on canvas paintings & one drawing by Beulah Stewart Moore

16. Photo of Beulah Stewart Moore

17. Portrait painting of Elliott Daingerfield

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

2009
Beulah Stewart Moore
1865-1948

18. The Travelers Plaque on the grounds of the Rowan Public Library

The Travelers Club

19. Page 7 and 27, the 1916 republished History of Rowan County, North Carolina, Miss Beulah’s bylines

A NEW PREFACE

has a fairer and broader historic background, as yet almost unexplored. “Ill fares it with a State whose history is written by others than her own sons!”

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

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

—BEULAH STEWART MOORE

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

Blameless and exemplary in all the relations of life, a Christian gentleman, he met all the requirements of the highest citizenship—and what higher eulogy can any hope to merit?

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

—MRS. BEULAH STEWART MOORE
20. October Tour brochure, October 9 and 10, 2004, cover photo of the Moore House

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

From House & Garden Magazine

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

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

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

Dear Ms. Garner:

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Kristi Brantley
Local Preservation Commissions/CLG Coordinator

CC: Commission Chair

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION 12. This Ordinance shall be effective on the date of adoption.
6. ORIGINAL INTERIOR FEATURES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. NEW AND NON-CONFORMING FEATURES

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

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

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

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

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

§ 105-278. Historic properties.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Example 2: Large Historic Residence**

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

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

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

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

Additional Resources:
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Requested Council Meeting Date: 02/02/2021

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

Name of Presenter(s): Catherine Garner

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

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

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

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

Council held a public hearing on January 19, 2021. Additional comments received have been forwarded to Council.

Attachments: ☑ Yes ☐ No

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

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

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

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

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

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________ _____________________________
Finance Manager Signature Department Head Signature

______________________________
Budget Manager Signature

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

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved ☐ Delayed ☐ Declined

Reason:
HPC STAFF REPORT

Case #:
HL-01-2020

Case Staff:
Catherine Garner

Owner(s):
Historic Salisbury Foundation, Inc.

Applicant(s):
Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer

Authorized Agent(s):
Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer

LOCATION

District:
N/A

Building:
Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House (RW #0998)

Street:
619 S Main Street

Tax Parcel #:
015 397

BUILDING DESCRIPTION:

Classification:
Individually Listed

Year Built:
Ca. 1897

Style:
Second Empire

Project Type:
Local Historic Landmark Pre-Application

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

When individually listed on the National Register in 2013, the house was only found to have significance under Criterion B.

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

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

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/ELEMENTS:

Please refer to the information provided with the application.

LOCAL LANDMARK CRITERIA:

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

**STAFF FINDINGS:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**PRE-APPLICATION DECISION**

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

**SHPO COMMENT**

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

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

The HPC held a public hearing at their December 10, 2020 regular meeting. The Commission reviewed the final report, SHPO comment letter, and staff report. Ms. Karen Lilly-Bowyer spoke on behalf of the application. The Commission voted unanimously of members present to find that the property exhibits special significance and integrity and to recommend approval of the designation to City Council.
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I. General Information
   1. Common Name: Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House
   2. Location: 619 South Main Street, Salisbury, NC
   3. Tax parcel ID: 015 397
   4. Owner: Historic Salisbury Foundation
   5. Owner Address: PO BOX 4221, Salisbury, NC 28145
   6. Appraised Tax Value: $269,360.00

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

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

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

   House Interior

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

III. Historical Background

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless died on January 27, 1920, at the age of sixty-eight. McCanless’s obituary and a tribute written by James F. Hurley Sr., editor of the
Salisbury Post, summarize the considerable contributions he made to Salisbury and to Rowan County. His obituary labeled him “A Great Builder,” “one who worked by day and dreamed and planned by night” The obituary continued, “He was always promoting the material prosperity of the county. He was no doubt identified with more enterprises than any other man of this county of any age. Much of Salisbury of today is due in very large measure to Mr. McCanless’ activities and interest. Manufacture, mining, quarrying, banking, and other activities owe much to his guiding hand and wisdom.”

Hurley’s editorial tribute added that “In the city stand monuments to his genius, his faith, his vision and his fidelity. Spindles hum because of his energies. Streets and buildings which were the inspirations of his mind and tangible evidence of his wisdom and achievement remain to bless mankind. Covering many years, he wrought heroically [sic] and left ample physical evidence of the practicability of his planning.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Additions and Alterations

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

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

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

2019-2020 Historic Salisbury Foundation cleaned the property which

---

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

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

2. Architectural Description Exterior:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Kitchen**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on this discussion of the physical integrity of the Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House, the following can be concluded. Except for the deteriorated

---

5 Phillips.2014.
condition of the wraparound porch roof, and several replacement windows, the exterior of the house is in excellent condition. The condition of the interior ranges from poor to good, depending on the location. Considering the seven aspects of integrity: The house remains at its original location on South Main Street in Salisbury. During McCanless’s lifetime, the physical setting of the house included the same flat terrain on which it currently stands is intact. The house stood in the midst of nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century dwellings along both sides of the street. Although today most of those houses have been replaced by small commercial buildings and vacant lots as the commercial center of Salisbury has moved southward. The house retains its physical relationship with South Main Street to the west and the railroad to the east that separates the property from the National Cemetery. Except for the replacement windows and the deteriorated porch roof, the exterior of the house displays a high degree of integrity in terms of its design, materials, and workmanship. Because of the poor treatment the interior the house received in the last quarter century as a result of remodeling efforts, the interior as a whole does not possess strong integrity of design, materials, and workmanship. The interior does retain a large percentage of its most character-defining stylistic features that reflect the sophisticated tastes of the McCanlesses. Due to its Second Empire and Colonial Revival stylistic features and strong use of granite and slate, the house conveys the feeling of the later nineteenth/early twentieth century house in an urban setting with easy access to granite quarries in the area. In retaining, for the most part, its original exterior appearance and to a lesser extent, many original interior features, the house retains a strong association with N.B. McCanless, who built it in 1897 as his family home and resided here until his death in 1920. During those years, he was a mover and a shaker in the development of Salisbury. Deteriorated and missing materials on the porch can be repaired while the introduction of vinyl windows and the installation of modern doors and a fire escape on the back of the house are minimally visible and the windows and doors can be replaced with reproduction features. All of these alterations, even when taken collectively, do not detract significantly from the house’s overall architectural integrity. Overall, despite the integrity issues associated with the interior, The Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House retains sufficient integrity for inclusion in the National Register under criterion B and should be recognized as a local landmark.

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

V. Supporting documentation

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

2. Sketch of Floor Plan Power Point Slides: 18-22
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Napoleon Bonaparte McCanless House

619 South Main Street
Salisbury, NC
Historic Salisbury Foundation, INC./ owner
Over all view from S. Main Street
Front/East Elevation
Rear/West Elevation
Left side/South Elevation
Right parlor curved wall
Hearth with period tile
Left parlor stairs
October 30, 2020

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

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

Dear Ms. Garner:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Kristi Brantley
Local Preservation Commissions/CLG Coordinator

CC: Commission Chair

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

House Interior

Local designation of the house interior is not being requested. The interior has lost most of its integrity due to multiple ownership and attempts to modernize. However, there
Local Historic Landmark Designation: Tax Implications

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

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

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

§ 105-278. Historic properties.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Example 2: Large Historic Residence**

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

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

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

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

### Additional Resources:
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

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

Requested Council Meeting Date: February 2, 2021

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

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

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

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

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

Attachments: ☒ Yes □ No

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

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

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

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

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

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________ _____________________________
Finance Manager Signature  Department Head Signature

Hannah Jacobson
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

Budget Manager Signature

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

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved  ☐ Delayed  ☐ Declined

Reason:
MEMO

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

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

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

December 7, 2020  

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

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

Dear Ms. Garner:

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

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

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

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Kevin Cherry  
State Historic Preservation Officer  

KC/jhs  

Enclosures  

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   ____________________________  ____________________________
   Signature of commenting official:  Date
   Title:  State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government
4. National Park Service Certification
I hereby certify that this property is:
___ entered in the National Register
___ determined eligible for the National Register
___ determined not eligible for the National Register
___ removed from the National Register
___ other (explain:)

Signature of the Keeper __________________________ Date of Action __________________________

5. Classification
Ownership of Property
(Check as many boxes as apply.)
Private: [X]
Public – Local
Public – State
Public – Federal

Category of Property
(Check only one box.)
Building(s) [X]
District
Site
Structure
Object

Sections 1-6 page 2
Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 buildings</td>
<td>0 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 structures</td>
<td>0 objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

DOMESTIC / single dwelling

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

DOMESTIC / single dwelling
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Spanish Colonial Revival

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

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

Summary Paragraph

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

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

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

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

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

---

**Narrative Description**


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

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

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

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

**Interior**

Like the exterior of the house, the interior also maintains its historical integrity. The configuration of the rooms has not been altered and the materials are original. Routine maintenance when needed, has been done using original materials. The interior walls are semi-rough textured stucco. With the exceptions of the bathrooms and kitchen, all rooms have basic 2 7/8-inch crown moldings and 5 ½ inch colonial style baseboards. The two and a quarter inch tongue and groove red tiger oak flooring is original. The bathrooms have their original mosaic tile floors. The window moldings and door facings are simple 4 ¼ inch unpainted stained wood facings in keeping with the Spanish Colonial Revival style. The only exceptions to this are the moldings in the kitchen, breakfast rooms and the bathrooms. Those moldings were painted white before the current occupants purchased the house. Most likely, these moldings were painted by Mr. Temple sometime after the house was built.

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Courtyards & Gardens, ca. 1936

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Garage, ca. 1936**

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

**Chicken House, ca.1936**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

ARCHITECTURE


Period of Significance
1936
Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

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

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

**Criterion C – Architecture Context**

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

---

88 Ibid., 522.
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12 Jacobson, Patterns of Home: Ten essential of Enduring Design, 52
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Nationally, Spanish Colonial Revival homes are most commonly cross gabled, while approximately one quarter have side-gabled roofs. Less common, some feature a hipped or flat roof. Some landmark Spanish Colonial Revival residences have rambling compound plans with hipped and gabled roofs combined to mimic roof patterns found in Spanish villages. Character-defining features of the style include asymmetry; low-pitched roofs with minimal eave overhang clad in red tiles; stucco wall finishes (smooth, rough, or tooled); lack of eave or trim between lower walls and upper gable; brick or tile vents in gable ends; round or square towers; and chimneys featuring tilework. Prominent arches are often located at principal windows or on porches. A large focal window is a common feature, often triple-arched or parabolic and some with stained glass designs. Dramatically curved doors, arched doors, and vertical panel doors are accented by patterned tiles, Solomonic columns, pilasters, or carved stonework.

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

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

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

\[15\] McAlester (2013) pg.
\[16\] McAlester (2013) pg.
\[17\] McAlester (2013) pg.
\[18\] Bishir, Guide to Piedmont Architecture, pg. 423.
\[19\] Bishir, Piedmont p. 424.
\[20\] Ibid. (Bishir, Piedmont, p. 424).
\[21\] Hood, Rowan County Architecture, p. 304.
of Spanish Mission style, the Franklin Smith, Sr. House, at 201 S. Fulton, built ca.1910, and the house at 200 S. Jackson Street, built ca.1914 (also addressed as 301 W. Fisher St.). These two-story stucco-clad homes feature bracketed hipped roofs clad with red clay Spanish tiles, sweeping verandas and shaped gables. Built before 1920, these homes are formal two-story rectangular dwellings with Mission shaped dormers and/or roof parapets that reflect the Spanish Mission style construction that was popular in the nineteenth century and later, but primarily before the great depression.22 Neither of these homes are individually listed in the National Register. These homes are similar to the Temple House in that they have stucco exterior covering construction and clay tile roofs. However, they do not share the essential style elements of the Spanish Colonial Revival period that are integral to the Temple House.

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

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

---

23 Hood, Rowan County, p.304.
niche lines up with the original intact triangular fishpond. Raised planting beds and trees and bushes planted by Mr. Temple remain intact today. The interior of the Temple House retains its original floor plan, as well as semi-rough textured stucco walls, 2 ¼ -inch tongue-in-groove red tiger oak flooring, mosaic tile in bathrooms, unpainted stained wood window and door facings, eight-panel wood doors, 15-light French doors, brass door hardware, most of the original ceiling light fixtures, and a massive focal living room chimney with bracketed heavy board mantel.

Additional Historical Background

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

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

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

Builder – Edgar S. Temple

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

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

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

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

In December of 1933, the Temples purchased two tracts of land, approximately four acres, from the Salisbury Development Company, which was the developer of the Milford Hills Residential Park. Construction of the house began in 1934 and the home was completed in 1936. Mr. Temple’s creative talents are seen across many Salisbury business and residential landscapes. He created exceptional landscaping for St John’s Lutheran Church which is a downtown landmark. When working on landscapes for the church’s new buildings in 1968,
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27 Madge Sigmon Temple. “Daddy’s School Teaching Information” (dictated to daughter Elaine in 1990)
28 Temple, “Daddy’s School Teaching Information”
29 Madge Sigmon Temple, “Personal writing for her 50th, Lenoir-Rhyne College Reunion.” (1977)
he discovered one of Salisbury’s original five wells.30 His careful handling of this historical site enabled the establishment of a well house that marked the location of the historic well.

Mr. Temple worked as a contractor for the US Veterans Administration and was instrumental in the development of landscaping for the local Veterans’ Hospital. Temple was also the landscape contractor for the historic National Military Cemetery in Salisbury. When the cemetery administration decided to dispose of a gazebo that had been placed in the cemetery in the 1870s, Mr. Temple purchased the gazebo, restored it, and placed it on a flagstone pad in his home garden. After the death of Edgar and after Madge Temple left the house for health reasons, Mrs. Temple directed her children to give the gazebo to the city of Salisbury. 31 It now stands as a prime landmark in the downtown Salisbury Bell Tower Park. (The Veterans Administration in Salisbury was contacted about records of Mr. Temple’s work. Unfortunately, the VA does not keep records of contracted work.) Mr. Temple also worked for the Rowan County Government/School System. He designed and built the football fields for East, West, South, and North Rowan High Schools. Work on the football field is verified through family interviews, and word of mouth from local historians, however, the Rowan County school system records prior to the Salisbury / Rowan County school consolidation are not available. Local newspaper records for that time are not digitalized.

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

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

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

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

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned): RW2134

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property 1.255

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

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

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

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

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

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

Submit the following items with the completed form:

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

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

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

**Photo Log**

Name of Property: Temple, Edgar S. and Madge, House

City or Vicinity: Salisbury

County: Rowan

State: North Carolina

Photographer: Karen C. Lilly-Bowyer

Date Photographed:

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:

1 of ___.

**National Register Photo Selection T.B.D.**

---

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:** This information is being collected for nominations to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460 et seq.). We may not conduct or sponsor and you are not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**Estimated Burden Statement:** Public reporting burden for each response using this form is estimated to be between the Tier 1 and Tier 4 levels with the estimate of the time for each tier as follows:

- **Tier 1** - 60-100 hours
- **Tier 2** - 120 hours
- **Tier 3** - 230 hours
Tier 4 – 280 hours

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

Source: NC HPO, HPOWEB
Created by Hannah Beckman-Black 11-30-2020
Edgar S. and Madge Temple House
1604 Statesville Boulevard
Salisbury, Rowan County
North Carolina
National Register Boundary Map

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

Source: NC HPO, HPOWEB
Created by Hannah Beckman-Black 11-30-2020
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

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

Requested Council Meeting Date:  02/02/2021

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

Name of Presenter(s): Chris Tester / Craig Powers

Requested Agenda Item:  Council to consider awarding bridge repair contract to North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT).

Description of Requested Agenda Item:  Council to consider the awarding a contract to NCDOT, per NCGS 136-41.3(d), for bridge repairs to North Ellis Street bridge and East Fisher Street bridge to bring them up to National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS). The contract and the cost estimate of $185,758.00 are provided by NCDOT division 9 Bridge and Maintenance Engineering. In addition to this contract, there is another $122,242 allocated to additional materials, engineering inspections, and contracted services bringing the estimated total for repairs to $308,000.

Attachments:  ☑ Yes  ☐ No

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

In FY21 we budgeted $215,000 for the bridge repairs that includes materials, engineering inspections, and contracted services. To complete these repairs, an appropriation of $93,000 will be needed from general fund - fund balance.

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

Council to consider approval of a budget ordinance to appropriate general fund - fund balance of $93,000.

and

Council to approve a contract with NCDOT for bridge repairs to North Ellis Street bridge and East Fisher Street bridge in the amount of $185,758.00

Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Chris Tester – 704-216-7554, Craig Powers – 704-216-2718

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

☐ Regular Agenda (item to be discussed and possibly voted on by Council)
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

j.wade.furey
Finance Manager Signature

Anna Bungeisen
Budget Manager Signature

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

For Use in Clerk's Office Only

☐ Approved ☐ Delayed ☐ Declined

Reason:
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2020-2021 BUDGET ORDINANCE
OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA TO APPROPRIATE
FUND BALANCE IN GENERAL FUND FOR BRIDGE REPAIRS

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

Section 1. The City has approved an agreement with NCDOT for North Ellis Street and
East Fisher Street bridge repairs. This project will be covered with a transfer from General Fund -
Fund Balance. NC General Statutes require that the City appropriate these revenues so that they can
be legally spent.

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

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

   (1) Increase line item 010-000-000-499900 $  93,000
       Fund Balance

   (2) Increase line item 010-561-427-545000 $  93,000
       Special Projects

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

Section 5. That this ordinance shall be effective from and after its passage.
NORTH CAROLINA
ROWAN COUNTY

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

AND

CITY OF SALISBURY

DATE: 1/13/2021

WBS Elements: 36249.4277

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into on the last date executed below, by and between the North Carolina Department of Transportation, an agency of the State of North Carolina, hereinafter referred to as the "Department" and the City of Salisbury, hereinafter referred to as the "Municipality".

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Municipality has municipal bridges that need repairs to bring them up to National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS); and,

WHEREAS, the Department has agreed to perform the repairs and the Municipality has agreed to participate in the cost of the work as hereinafter set out; and,

WHEREAS, this Agreement is made under the authority of North Carolina General Statutes § 136-41.3(d) that allows the Department to perform work on municipal streets;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto, each in consideration of the promises and undertakings of the other as herein provided, do hereby covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

1. The Project consists of repairing the following two (2) bridges for the Municipality:

   A.) N. Ellis Street Bridge across Norfolk Southern Railroad (790393):
      • Repair Bent 2 Footing
      • Replace timber pile on Bent 2
      • Repair steel beam
      • Repair timber floor and deck

   B) E. Fisher Street Bridge across Norfolk Southern Railroad (790138):
      • Replace 4 timber joists
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• Replace 2 timber caps
• Replace 2 timber piles
• Replace 2 timber cross braces

FUNDING

2. The Municipality shall reimburse the Department one hundred percent (100%) of the actual cost of all work performed by the Department, including administrative costs. Based on the estimated cost of $185,758.00, the Municipality shall submit a check to the Department’s Division Engineer upon partial execution of this Agreement by the Municipality. Upon completion of the project, if actual costs exceed the amount of payment, the Municipality shall reimburse the Department any underpayment within sixty (60) days of invoicing by the Department. If the actual cost of the work is less than $185,758.00, the Department shall reimburse the Municipality any overpayment. The Department shall charge a late payment penalty and interest on any unpaid balance due in accordance with G.S. 147-86.23.

UTILITIES AND RIGHT OF WAY

3. The Municipality shall accomplish the relocation and/or adjustment of any and all utilities in conflict with the construction of the project. Said work shall be accomplished in a manner satisfactory to the Department, and without cost to the Department.

4. It is understood by all parties hereto that all work shall be contained within existing right of way. However, should it become necessary, the Municipality shall provide any required right of way and/or construction easements at no cost or liability whatsoever to the Department. Acquisition of right of way shall be accomplished in accordance with State procedures. The Municipality shall indemnify and save the Department harmless from any and all claims for damages that might arise on account of damage to public or private property and right of way acquisition, drainage and construction easements for the construction of the project.

CONSTRUCTION

5. The Department shall construct or have constructed the repairs to the bridges. All work shall be performed in accordance with the Department’s Standard Specifications, and applicable local codes, ordinances, and procedures.
MAINTENANCE

6. Upon completion of the work, the bridges shall be owned and controlled by the Municipality and the maintenance of the bridges shall be accomplished in the same manner as maintenance of other municipal bridges.

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

7. The Department shall not be liable and shall be held harmless from any and all claims that might arise on account of the Municipality negligence and/or responsibilities under the terms of this agreement and/or project.

8. The other party to this Agreement shall comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title 49 CFR, Subtitle A, Part 21) and related nondiscrimination authorities. Title VI and related authorities prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, disability, gender, and age in all programs or activities of any recipient of Federal assistance.

9. A copy or facsimile copy of the signature of any party shall be deemed an original with each fully executed copy of the Agreement as binding as an original, and the parties agree that this Agreement can be executed in counterparts, as duplicate originals, with facsimile signatures sufficient to evidence an agreement to be bound by the terms of the Agreement.

10. By Executive Order 24, issued by Governor Perdue, and N.C. G.S.§ 133-32, it is unlawful for any vendor or contractor (i.e. architect, bidder, contractor, construction manager, design professional, engineer, landlord, offeror, seller, subcontractor, supplier, or vendor), to make gifts or to give favors to any State employee of the Governor’s Cabinet Agencies (i.e., Administration, Commerce, Environmental Quality, Health and Human Services, Information Technology, Military and Veterans Affairs, Natural and Cultural Resources, Public Safety, Revenue, Transportation, and the Office of the Governor).
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been executed, in duplicate, the day and year heretofore set out, on the part of the Department and the Municipality by authority duly given.

ATTEST:  
CITY OF SALISBURY

BY:  
TITLE:  
DATE:  

Approved by __________________________ of the local governing body of the City of Salisbury as attested to by the signature of Clerk of said governing body on __________________________(Date)

N.C.G.S. § 133-32 and Executive Order 24 prohibit the offer to, or acceptance by, any State Employee of any gift from anyone with a contract with the State, or from any person seeking to do business with the State. By execution of any response in this procurement, you attest, for your entire organization and its employees or agents, that you are not aware that any such gift has been offered, accepted, or promised by any employees of your organization.

Federal Tax Identification Number  

(SEAL)  
Remittance Address:  
City of Salisbury  

________________________________________  

________________________________________  

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

BY:  
(CHIEF ENGINEER)  
DATE:  

PRESENTED TO BOARD OF TRANSPORTATION ITEM O:  

Agreement ID # 9642
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

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

Requested Council Meeting Date:  February 2, 2021

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

Name of Presenter(s):

Requested Agenda Item:  Announcement regarding applications for boards and commissions.

Description ofRequested Agenda Item:  The City of Salisbury is seeking applications from citizens who have an interest in serving on one of the City’s Boards and Commissions. Information regarding the Boards and Commissions and an online application are available online at salisburync.gov under City Council and Boards and Commissions tab. Applications are also available or by emailing Kelly Baker at kbake@salisburync.gov or by calling 704-638-5223.

Attachments:  ☑ Yes  ☐ No

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

Action Requested of Council for Agenda Item:  Announce applications are being sought for the City’s Boards and Commissions.

(Please note if item includes an ordinance, resolution or petition)

Contact Information for Group or Individual:  Kelly Baker, 704-638-5233

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

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

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________  ______________________________
Finance Manager Signature  Department Head Signature

_________________________________
Budget Manager Signature

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

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only

☐ Approved           ☐ Delayed           ☐ Declined

Reason:
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

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

Requested Council Meeting Date: February 2, 2021

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

Name of Presenter(s):

Requested Agenda Item: Announcement regarding City Council’s 2021 goal setting retreat.

Description of Requested Agenda Item: City Council will hold its annual goal setting Retreat Wednesday, February 10, 2021 at 5:00 p.m. and Thursday, February 11, 2021 at 5:00 p.m. The Retreat will be held virtually via Zoom. The meetings will be livestreamed at www.salisburync.gov/webcast and through the City’s Twitter account. Additional information on the virtual meeting will be posted on the City’s website at www.salisburync.gov under public notices.

Attachments: □ Yes □ No

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

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

Contact Information for Group or Individual: Kelly Baker, 704-638-5233, kbake@salisburync.gov

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

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

FINANCE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION:

_________________________________  _____________________________
Finance Manager Signature        Department Head Signature

_________________________________
Budget Manager Signature

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

For Use in Clerk’s Office Only
Salisbury City Council
Agenda Item Request Form

☐ Approved  ☐ Delayed  ☐ Declined

Reason: