

Salisbury Historic District Commission

September 24, 2025

The Salisbury Historic District Commission met in regular session on Wednesday, **September 24, 2025**. The meeting took place at 125 N Division St, Room 301, with attendance as follows:

COMMISSIONERS

Acting Chairman – Brenden Frederick – *Present*

Vice Chairman – Matt Auchey – *Present*

Commissioner – Lynne Bratten – *Present*

Commissioner – Margaret Lawson - *Present*

Commissioner – *Lisa Gingrich* - *Present*

Commissioner – Brad Philips –*Present*

CITY OFFICIALS

City Attorney – Laura Ryan – *Present*

Associate Planner – Will Canner – *Present*

City Planner – Betsey Jackson – *Present*

Associate Planner – Jennifer Jean – *Present*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – **Mr. Brenden Frederick** called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.
2. **ROLL CALL** - Each member of the Commission introduced themselves for the record. The Acting Chairman explained the meeting procedure to all applicants and administered the oath en masse to all persons intending to testify.
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – **Ms. Laura Ryan** recommended to separate the minutes by month to ensure the commissioners did not vote on the month they were not present. **Mr. Matt Auchey** made a motion to approve the June minutes, seconded by **Ms. Margaret Lawson**. The motion was brought to vote and approved. **Ms. Lisa Gingrich** was made a motion to approve the July minutes, seconded by **Mr. Brad Phillips**. The motion was brought to vote and approved. **Mr. Auchey** made a motion to approve the August minutes, seconded by **Ms. Gingrich**. The motion was brought to vote and approved.
4. **PUBLIC INPUT** – Members of the public are welcome to comment, subject to a time allotment of two (2) minutes per person.
5. **CONSENT DOCKET** – **None**.
6. **OLD BUSINESS** – **None**.
7. **NEW BUSINESS** -

Case #25-18 - 302 N Division St - Alterations - Replacement of Roof

Discussion Summary:

- **Mr. Frederick** determined that a motion needed to take place regarding if the site is contributing.
- **Mr. Auchey** made a motion to deem the structure as contributing based on the property being on the Wicomico County Historic Survey. **Mr. Phillips** seconded the motion. The

property was then brought to vote and passed therefore deemed contributing by the commission.

- **Mr. Will Canner** read the staff report, recommending approval due to the roof having structural integrity issues presented by documentation from a roofing company hired by the applicant as well as pictures showing the damage.
- **Mr. Blair Carey**, property owner, presented a request to replace the roof with synthetic slate mimicking the currently present slate. As well as rustic black shingles to replace the asphalt shingling. The rest of the exterior would be preserved as-is.
- The Commission approved the proposed Roof replacement mimicking the old style and stated that rustic black shingles replaced in-kind would not require additional approval.

Public Comment- Members of the public are welcome to comment at this time, subject to a time allotment of two (2) minutes per person.

Public Comment: None

Motion and Vote:

- *Motion:* **Mr. Auchey** moved to approve the Roof Replacement.
- *Second:* **Mr. Phillips** seconded the motion.
- *Vote:* **Mr. Frederick** called for a vote. The application was **approved as submitted**.

Case #25-19 - 105 Oakdale Rd - Alterations - Replace Shutters/Approve Exterior Panels

Discussion Summary:

- **Mr. Frederick** determined that a motion needed to take place regarding if the site is contributing. The Commissions went through their checklist of determining contributing factors.
- **Mr. Auchey** made a motion to deem the structure as contributing based upon Exhibit A. **Ms. Gingrich** seconded the motion. The property was then brought to vote and passed therefore deemed contributing by the commission.
- **Mr. Canner** read the staff report, recommending the proposal be denied as White Vinyl Shutters are typically not appropriate. The alternative recommended are wood or not replaced.
- **Mr. Melvin R. Seldon Sr.**, property owner, presented a request to replace the shutters and voluntarily requested to amend the application to include Wood Shutters instead of Vinyl White Shutters.
- **Mr. Auchey** made a motion to approve the Wooden Shutters as amended on the Front, East, and West to correspond with the window sizes, and to approve the panel. **Ms. Lawson** seconded the motion. The motion was brought to vote and resulted in a split vote..
- The Commissioners deliberated further and decided that the applicant should use vinyl shutters sized to match the full height of the window and panel. **Ms. Gingrich**

motioned to retroactively approve the exterior paneling. **Ms. Lynne Bratten** seconded the motion. The motion was brought to vote and approved.

The Commission then retroactively asked the applicant if he would be willing to proceed with his original application, to which he agreed. The Commission brought the original application, as submitted, for white vinyl shutters — long on the Front and East elevations and short on the West — to a vote, and it was approved.

Public Comment- Members of the public are welcome to comment at this time, subject to a time allotment of two (2) minutes per person.

Public Comment: **Mr. Wirt Wolfe** made a comment about the period of time the material that would be used is either Metal or Vinyl for the Shutters as the house was built in the 1960's.

Motion and Vote:

- *Motion:* **Mr. Auchey** moved to approve the White Vinyl Shutters.
- *Second:* **Mr. Phillips** seconded the motion.
- *Vote:* **Mr. Frederick** called for a vote. The application was **approved as submitted**.

Case #25-20 - 307 Newton - Alterations - Replace Front/Back Stairways with Concrete Blocks/Red Bricks

Discussion Summary:

- **Mr. Canner** read the staff report, recommending the material remain wood for both staircases as the staircases were previously made of wood, although noting that Brick is an allowable material by Appendix B.
- **Mr. Zaheer Ahmed**, Applicant state that there are Staircases in vicinity that are made of brick.
- **Mr. Auchey** stated that the existing staircase is likely not original and noted that stairways on Newton Street are constructed of both wood and brick. He commented that brick would be more durable and age better than wood. Since the back staircase is not visible from the street and its original material cannot be verified, it would not be an issue. Mr. Auchey requested to amend the application to include parging the sides of the back staircase.
- The commission brought the amended application to vote and was approved.

Motion and Vote:

- *Motion:* **Mr. Auchey** moved to approve the Front and Back Staircases only requesting that the Back Staircase sides be parged.
- *Second:* **Mr. Phillips** seconded the motion.
- *Vote:* **Mr. Frederick** called for a vote. The application was **approved as amended**.

Adjournment:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned following the vote.

This is a summary of the proceedings of this meeting. Detailed information is in the permanent files of each case as presented and filed in the City of Salisbury, Housing & Community Development Department.



Brenden Frederick, Acting Chairman

11/10/2025

Date



Will Canner, Associate Planner

11/06/2025

Date

Structure Features	Contributing	Non-contributing	Not Applicable	Notes
Overall proportion of house	✓			original location
Front Door	✓			
Front door side lights			N/A	
porch layout	✓			original
porch flooring	✓			spare
porch railings	✓			metal
porch columns			N/A	
front steps	✓			brick
bay window			N/A	
windows	✓			wood
Shutters		✓		Vinyl
dormer windows			N/A	
basement windows			N/A	
stained glass windows			N/A	
storms on windows		✓		metal
siding	✓			wood
roof		✓		asphalt
rear porch		✓		addition
trim around windows	✓			wood
facia	✓			wood - dentel detail
soffit/leaves	✓			wood
gutters		✓		vinyl
Additions or Modifications		✓		rear addition
Other 1				
Other 2				
Other 3				
Other 4				
Other 5				
Other 6				

11 6