

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Minutes

September 11, 2008

The Historic Preservation Commission for the City of Salisbury met in regular session on Thursday, September 11th in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, 217 S. Main Street.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, Anne Lyles. She read the purpose and procedure for the meeting.

In addition to Anne Lyles, the following members were present and introduced: Jack Errante, Ronald Fleming, Susan Hurt, Deborah Johnson, Judy Kandl, and Andrew Pitner

Absent: Kathy Walters, Anne Waters

Requests for Certificates of Appropriateness

H-23-08 428 N. Main St. – J. C. Harris Holdings, LLC, owner
Attorney John W. Dees, II, agent

Request: Exterior modifications to 2 buildings

Janet Gapen was sworn to give testimony regarding the request.

Ms. Gapen began by reminding commission members that case #H-23-08 was assigned to a committee at the August 14th HPC meeting for further study. The committee met at the site on August 27th with the property owner and his attorney/agent to inspect the property and to review an amended application.

Ms. Gapen stated in the committee report that much of the application deals with windows. She stated: “Where *changes* are requested to windows, whether they were inherited with incompatible wood infill or the original windows were intact but severely deteriorated, the committee made recommendations based on the design guidelines. In the case of filled-in windows that the owner wishes to retain in their current state, the committee made suggestions for infilling in a more compatible way.”

Slides were presented as Ms. Gapen described the following recommendations suggested by the committee:

Building #1

A. Front elevation:

Appearance is proposed to remain unchanged at this time.

B. North side elevation:

1. Pictures of sample colors were presented for review.

2. Committee suggested a fill-in with matching brick for the 4 windows instead of the existing wood infill, and to have the fill-in area slightly recessed and painted to match the rest of the building.

C. Rear elevation:

1. Committee recommended recessed brick infill for the 2 outer windows rather than the requested wood fill-in, to match existing brick.
2. Committee recommended brick infill around the central located vent and that the vent be painted to match the final color of the building.

D. Southside elevation

Complete painting in the approved color. The small existing windows will remain as they are.

Building #2 – West Cemetery Street

A. Front elevation (facing Cemetery St.)

Paint the front and other sides of the building in the current muted green color. The building is cement block and had been white before the green color was applied. **(To be discussed.)**

B. East side elevation (facing N. Main St. and the rear of building #1.)

1. Committee recommends approval of the request for a new stack to match the previous deteriorated deck. Deck will be stained to match the final paint color.
2. Committee recommended the following options for the approval of a wood fill-in of a deteriorated loading bay door which was removed and a small window installed in the opening: (1) fill in completely with matching cement block, slightly recessed; or (2) install an aluminum window system to fill the original opening, divided vertically into 2 or 3 panes. However, the #2 option was more strongly suggested in order to have functionality of the interior space.
3. Committee recommended that the opening where a vent was removed be filled in with matching cement block, recessed, without a wood frame, and painted to match the final color of the building.
4. Completion of the installation of vinyl ventilated eaves. **(To be discussed.)**
5. Removal of canopy over loading dock. **(To be discussed.)**
6. The request to install one new HVAC unit was withdrawn by the applicant.
7. Committee suggested consideration of an aluminum storefront door with transom or a same-size door with sidelight and transom to match the storefront on the front of the building rather than an existing paneled side door with infill.

C. Rear elevation

1. Committee recommended that an existing central window opening be filled in completed with cement block rather than wood as requested.
2. Committee recommended that all windows be made of aluminum to carry forward the window material existing on the front of the building. The new window on left side on rear elevation should be made to fit the original opening, the window on the right be infilled on the top with CMU, and the new window be made to fit the remaining opening.

D. West side elevation (Church St. side)

1. Committee recommended that an existing window to the far right be made of aluminum to fit the original opening rather than a vinyl window with interior muntins and cement infill as completed.
2. Committee suggested that the left and central windows be replaced with aluminum windows to match the storefront.

Other requests:

Pave parking lot: Applicant was advised to submit a plan for configuration of parking lot paving and landscaping. **(To be deferred to another meeting.)**

Following Janet Gapen's presentation, Judy Kandl commended Ms. Gapen's detailed report of a very complicated application. She then referred commission members to #2 on page 3 of the report. Referencing the request for filling in the loading dock opening and the committee's strong suggestion that an aluminum window be installed, she stated that it should be noted that not only was the recommendation made because of functionality of the interior space, but also for the appearance on the outside of the building since it would no longer be a loading dock.

There being no other comments from the committee members, the applicants, Jay Dees, attorney, and Ralph Baker, owner, were called by the Chair to be sworn in for testimony.

Jay Dees commended the committee members and Janet Gapen for their time and reasonableness in going over the application.

Jay Dees testified that after going through the committee report Mr. Baker is in agreement with all the suggestions made by the committee for building #2. In addition, he specifically noted that he also agrees to the glass infill for that area as opposed to closing the opening in.

On building #1, Jay Dees testified that Mr. Baker would at this time like to keep the wood closed windows because of the financial standpoint. In reference to the paint color, he stated that Mr. Baker would like to request approval of the color as presented because of the softness of the muted green color as compared to the more harsh red color, especially during the day. In addition, he stated Mr. Baker would agree to brick surround the vent located on the rear of building #1.

Janet Gapen referenced the 2 large single pane windows located on the west side elevation of building #2 and asked if the applicant planned to change them to aluminum or to leave them as existing.

Mr. Baker stated that upon inspection of the windows, along with enforcement officer, Ron Paxton, they found that the windows were already aluminum. Mr. Paxton confirmed that his statement was correct.

In response to questions from Judy Kandl, Mr. Baker indicated from the slides (from his recollection) the windows that were already boarded up when he took over the building and those that were boarded up prior to his requests for approval from the commission.

Ms. Kandl read guideline #9 from Sect. 2.4.2 Windows and Doors: *It is not appropriate to fill in existing windows or door openings or to replace or cover them with plywood.*

Following which Mr. Baker said he would be willing to put brick on all of the openings on the rear elevation of building 1.

In reference to questions from Judy Kandl concerning painting of building #1, Jay Dees confirmed that her analysis that the surface to be painted was brick and had not been painted before, was correct.

Ms. Kandl then read guideline #4 from the masonry guidelines: *It is not appropriate to apply paint or other coatings to unpainted masonry elements that were historically not coated.* She continued with paint guideline #1: *It is not appropriate to paint unpainted brick and stone, or to paint copper and bronze,* and #2: *It repainting of a previously painted masonry surface is necessary use appropriate masonry paint and choose a color that matches that of the original masonry as closely as possible.* She suggested that the buildings be painted as the separate buildings that they are.

Ms. Kandl observed that the first building on the corner would have more of a presence than the 2nd building behind it which is a smaller sidekick building. She suggested that a different color be chosen for building #1 than building #2 which would prevent it from being a clone of a building that is already different.

Susan Hurt stated that painting over the brick was regrettable, but the paint was not coming off now or in the future so in her opinion the color does not matter.

Mr. Baker told commission members that it was their desire to make the buildings look good for the city of Salisbury. He said he would like for his buildings to look as beautiful as the Rowan County building and the F&M building. In describing the proposed paint color for the building, Mr. Baker said it was not as gray as it appears on the slide, but was more so khaki color.

Ralph Baker, Jr. after being sworn in presented paint samples to show that the proposed color looks different on the building. He said their intent was to choose a color that would blend in with the other buildings in the block.

Anne Lyles informed commission members that she had gone to the site to view the paint samples on the buildings and her reaction was, "None of them really do it." She said she prefers the Beechwood.

Public Hearing

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Deliberation

Judy Kandl began the deliberation with the paint for building #2. She said, "I think the paint selection for building #2 is fine and would be acceptable by the guidelines."

In reference to the ventilation cover on building 2, Judy Kandl read– Architectural Details & Ornamentation, guideline #3: It is not appropriate to remove or cover any original detail or ornamentation: *If original features are currently covered, it is encouraged that these features be uncovered, exposed, and repaired.*

In reference to Susan Hurt who asked what the feature was that has been covered, Ms. Kandl said, “It’s basically the end of the structure system.” She said they are exposed on some buildings or houses and some of them are not; it depends upon the commercial structure.

Janet Gapen said she thought the feature was more common with the early 20th century buildings than a mid-century building but she could not explain why it was carried forth onto this particular building.

Susan Hurt said, “I can imagine buildings where I would say a defining architectural feature has been covered but I’m not convinced that a defining feature has been covered on this building.”

In reference to paint colors for building #1, Susan Hurt said it was her opinion that the paint color requested is as best as it can be. She agreed with Judy Kandl’s earlier observation that there was really no reasons for the 2 buildings to be the same color.

Anne Lyles reminded commission members that the color of the adjoining buildings should be considered. She suggested the possibility of painting 2 sides in the requested color, Beechwood, and the other side to match the front as closely as possible.

Judy Kandl said she thinks it would be appropriate, per the guidelines, to paint the brick side in the closest color possible to brick and the remaining CMU side painted in the requested color.

Deborah Johnson stated that her opinion is that it be painted the muted green color with brick infill windows. Jack Errante agreed by saying that he thinks the color is very attractive; as did Anne Lyles who said she thinks that the color blends nicely with everything.

In response to Andrew Pitner who referenced comments made by Paul Fomberg to the committee, Janet Gapen said he recommended not painting the brick but leaned more toward more brick type brick colors if the building was to be painted. Mr. Pitner said he also agrees that it should be painted a brick color.

Janet Gapen said there are many different colors on brick buildings downtown. She said, “Certainly many of those have been painted for years and years and years.” She also noted that paint is easily changed.

Following the closure of all discussion relating to the request, Ronald Fleming made the motion as follows: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-23-08 – that John Dees, II, agent for J. C. Harris Holdings, LLC, owner of 418 North Main Street, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to do exterior modifications on 2 buildings; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or

oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Storefronts, pages 20-22, guidelines 1-7; Side & Rear Facades, pages 26-28, guidelines 1-9; Windows & Doors, pages 30-31, guidelines 1-12; Masonry, pages 31-33, guidelines 1-8 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-23-08 be granted, as amended, to John Dees, II, agent for J. C. Harris Holdings, LLC, owner of 418 N. Main Street, to make the changes detailed in the application with the following changes agreed to by the applicant - Building 2: to accept the changes as proposed in the committee; Building 1: to brick the 3 windows in the back with matching brick in the color of the building, and approval of the ventilation that has been put in, and to approve the Beechwood color on 3 sides of the building leaving the front as is.”

Jack Errante seconded the motion; Commission members Errante, Fleming, Lyles and Johnson voted AYE; members Hurt, Kandl, and Pitner voted NO.

Other Business

Minor works: There were no questions pertaining to the submitted minor work approvals.

Notes from Janet Gapen

New Intern

Kadejia Washington was introduced to the Commission. Ms. Washington, a student at Livingstone, will be working as an unpaid intern a total of 90 hours for the current semester. Ms. Gapen informed the Commission that Ms. Washington would be working on one of the Commission’s goals – development of a digital photographic archive of all historic district properties including the National Register districts.

Ms. Washington greeted the Commission and said she was a senior at Livingstone College with a double major – History & Political Science.

She was welcomed by the Commission.

Preservation NC Conference will be held October 9-11 in Winston-Salem. The city will pay the registration for Commission members who would like to attend. Janet asked that anyone who is interested to contact her by October 1st.

Enforcement

Request for approval of work that is currently underway at the Bell-South building at 220 S. Church St. will be on the October meeting agenda.

Ms. Gapen informed the Commission in reference to questions she has received concerning the property at Lee & Bank that since the city will be revamping the Code Services division, she has been told by her supervisor that the on-going problems at that property would be further

addressed once that restructure is in place. She said she would push to find out what she can as she can and keep the Commission updated.

Janet Gapen informed commission members that the work at 1001 N. Main has not yet been completed. She said the owner verbally promised that it would be completed as soon as the windows went in but that has not happened. She said if it is not done within 6 months after approval, he could receive one 6-month renewal.

Ron Paxton described the following code enforcement procedure: verbal warning - written warning - \$50 citation - \$100 citation - \$100 p/day.

In reference to a question from Jack Errante, Janet Gapen stated that there had not been a National Register designation for Catawba College. She said the college may have had an interest in applying for the designation but she does not recall it.

She further stated that a survey of properties was completed in 2001 that outlined several areas for either expansion of districts or new national register districts; however, there have not been funds available to pursue it. She said if and when the funds became available there would be no need to redo the survey work.

Judy Kandl asked if the businesses in the historic districts receive the same newsletter that is sent to residential properties. If not, she said, consideration should be given to it going to businesses as well which might make them aware that they are in a particular historic district.

Janet Gapen said the mailing is done twice a year and the last 2 went out to residences only; however, there have been times when it was mailed to the downtown businesses also. She said, "I just haven't done so every time just to minimize the mailing cost.

Minutes

The August minutes will be approved at the next meeting since all persons had not received them via email.

Adjournment

There being no additional business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Anne Lyles, Chairperson

Judy Jordan, Secretary

