Salisbury Historic District Commission
March 25, 2025

The Salisbury Historic District Commission met in regular session on Wednesday, **March 25, 2025**. The meeting took place at 125 N Division St, Room 301, with attendance as follows:

COMMISSIONERS
Brenden Frederick – Chairman – *Present*
Matt Auchey – Vice Chairman – *Present*
Margaret Lawson – Commissioner – *Present*
Lisa Gingrich – Commissioner – *Present*
Brad Philips – Commissioner – *Present*
Harvey Evans – Commissioner – *Present*
Luis DaSilva – Commissioner – *Present*

CITY OFFICIALS
Laura Ryan – City Attorney – *Present*
Henry Pearson – Associate Planner – *Present*
Scarlett Liberto – Associate Planner – *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 Chairman explained the meeting procedure to all applicants and administered the oath en masse to all persons intending to testify.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES –** Mr. Brad Phillips made a motion to approve the February minutes, seconded by Mrs. Lisa 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 –**

Case #26-04 – 220 N. Division St. – Alterations – Lead Paint Coverage/Window Replacement – Continuance

Mr. Frederick asked if the applicant is proposing an AZEK casing. The applicant agreed. Mr. Frederick said that they were concerned about the window sill replacement. Mrs. Gingrich asked what materials were used. She said that they used AZEK for everything. She said the AZEK looks like wood. Mr. Evans asked if the sill is one continuous piece. The applicant said that they took the entire window out and replaced the sill. Mr. Frederick said that they need to evaluate the appearance of the window from the exterior. Mrs. Gingrich asked again if they had nailed the sill to the outside. The applicant said that they made it into one piece. She said that there are 40 windows on the property and 10 have had the sills removed. Mr. Evans asked if she is going to remove the rest of the sills. The applicant said she would like to because they are rotting.

Mr. Frederick asked if she will remove all the trim on the remaining windows and replace it with what is on the example. She said that she wants to if they allow her. Mr. Phillips said that he does not have a problem with the sill replacement so long as the sills is not just tacked on. Mr. Frederick asked if they will approve the mockup and understand that this will require all

windows be replaced to match the mockup. Mrs. Gingrich mentioned that the mockup is different than what is existing on the house on the other windows.

Mr. Frederick said that they can approve the mockup, approve it with conditions, or require the applicant to return the windows to what was originally there. Mr. Frederick asked for a motion for any of those options. He said that the approval should be amended to require all of the windows on the building. The applicant said that that is what she wants to do after they paint the building.

Mr. Phillips made a motion to **approve** the application subject to the amendment that all windows are done in the exact same fashion as the window mockup that was submitted. Mrs. Lawson seconded the motion.

Public Comment: None

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Brad Phillips**
Second: **Margaret Lawson**
Vote: **Unanimous, Matt Auchey and Luis DaSilva obstained**

7. **NEW BUSINESS –**

Case #26-02* - 202 Elizabeth St. – Alterations –Window Grill Replacement

Mr. Pearson began reading the staff report. The property was not determined to be contributing, so Mr. Auchey read through the checklist to determine if the structure is contributing. Mr. Auchey made a motion to deem the structure contributing, seconded by Mrs. Gingrich. The structure was determined to be **contributing**.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Matt Auchey**
Second: **Lisa Gingrich**
Vote: **Unanimous**

Mr. Pearson finished reading the staff report. Mr. Frederick said that he agrees that the grills should be replaced on all windows. He said that he is concerned that they are proposing replacing the grills with "grills between the glass" which is not appropriate, and that they should instead be replaced with the full divided light grills. Mrs. Gingrich said that they could also do exterior grills. Mr. Frederick said that of the options that they have, the full divided light grills is the only option. Mr. Auchey agreed. Mr. Auchey made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the "full divided light grills" are installed instead of the proposed "grills between the glass" and that the grills are installed on all windows.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Matt Auchey**
Second: **Lisa Gingrich**
Vote: **Unanimous**

Case #26-06 – 311 Park Avenue – Additions – Rear Garage Addition

Mr. Pearson began reading the staff report. The structure had not been determined contributing, so Mr. Auchey went through the checklist. Mr. Auchey made a motion to determine the structure **contributing**. Mrs. Lawson seconded the motion.

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Matt Auchey**
Second: **Margaret Lawson**
Vote: **Unanimous**

The applicant stated that he was willing to make any changes to the structure to ensure that it is acceptable. Mr. Phillips stated that he was concerned that the structure wouldn't be approved by the city. He asked who is building it. The applicant said that he is building it and the city came out to give him a stop work order but that he needed historic approval first. Mr. Phillips said this proposal is obscuring the historic garage and is not typical. He said that he is concerned that the city is not going to give him a permit anyways and that this goes against the guidelines.

The applicant said that he can reduce the size if needed. Mr. Phillips asked what the applicant is planning to do with the space. The applicant said that he intended to use it for storage. Mr. Evans asked if he could use a storage trailer instead. Mr. Auchey said that the swinging doors on the garage add character to the house. He said the doors that are there now kill the character of the house. The applicant said that he has the original doors. Mr. Auchey said that building off of the front if a no-go for him. He would have preferred that he buy a shed versus destroying the garage. Mr. Auchey asked if the side addition was there already. Mrs. Gingrich said that the applicant had built that as well. Mr. Auchey said that a thoughtful addition could have been acceptable but the way that this was done is not acceptable.

The applicant said that he could make any necessary modifications. Mr. Auchey said that this will be a lot more involved than he realizes. He asked if the applicant could instead get a pre-built shed. The applicant said that he already has built some of the structure so he would prefer the current structure. Mr. Auchey said that if he wants to salvage what has been done, he needs to come back with plans done by a contractor showing how he will return the look of the front of the carriage house to its original character and construct a thoughtful side addition.

Mrs. Gingrich said that there is no drawing or photo of what it will look like once it is finished. She said that there is no coherent historically appropriate design and that is looks like a shanty addition. She said that she does not see how it could be restored and that there is no design to the structure. She said that these will be permanent changes. She said that the additions do not line up with the existing structure and that the additions look like shanties.

Mr. Frederick said that the structure will not be approved as submitted and that there are no simple modifications that can change that. He said that the addition out of the front would need to be significantly changed and that the swinging front doors would need to be reinstalled. He would need drawings from a contractor showing exactly what would be built, and even then it would be a slim chance of approval. He said that the side addition has a better chance of approval but that it is not acceptable as it is now. He said that he would need to speak to a

contractor to provide drawings. He said that he recommends that the applicant take the original doors and put them inside to protect them. He said that they can continue the case if the applicant thinks he can get a contractor by next month to show precisely what he intends to construct, or the applicant can withdraw the application and resubmit when he is ready. Mrs. Ryan advised the applicant that he cannot resubmit the application within a year if it is denied, and that he can withdraw the application and resubmit. The applicant asked if he needs to do anything in the meantime. Mr. Frederick said that no work can be done in the meantime before his application is resubmitted, and that he should protect the doors and whatever else he can.

Mrs. Gingrich emphasized that the application is for retroactive approval of the first addition and approval for the front section. She said that there is no design of what he has done that she considers historically appropriate. She said that there will need to be some major changes. Mr. Frederick asked what the applicant would like to do. The applicant decided to **withdraw** the application. Mr. Frederick asked if they will need to redetermine if the structure is contributing. Mrs. Ryan said that the motions were separate so they will not need to revote on that aspect. Mrs. Ryan recommended that the applicant contact the city as they will need to see progress on the structure.

Public Comment:

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **No motion, application incomplete.**
Second:
Vote:

Case #26-08 – Multiple Locations – Additions – Shore Walls Murals

Ms. Scarlett Liberto approached the table and read the staff report. Two of the locations had not been determined contributing. Mr. Auchey read through the checklist for 308 E. Main St. He made a motion that the property be determined **non-contributing**. Mrs. Lawson seconded the motion. Mrs. Gingrich asked if the front of the building was painted. The commissioners responded that it is not. Mrs. Gingrich said that the unpainted brick contributed to the historic nature. Mr. Auchey agreed but said that the design is not historic.

Public Comment: None

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Matt Auchey**
Second: **Margaret Lawson**
Vote: **Unanimous**

Mr. Auchey went through the checklist for 120 E. Market St. Mr. Auchey made a motion to determine the property non-contributing. Mrs. Gingrich and Mr. Phillips said that they disagree and think that it is contributing. Mrs. Gingrich said that it has the vibe of an older building with its details. Mr. Auchey reevaluated the structure using the checklist. He made a motion to determine the structure **contributing**. Mrs. Lawson seconded.

Motion and Vote:

Motion: **Matt Auchey**
Second: **Lisa Gingrich**
Vote: **6-1, Mrs. Lawson voting nay**

Ms. Liberto finished reading the staff report. The staff report stated that the book building was not painted, but Mr. Auchey stated that it was in fact painted. Mr. Auchey stated that he has no issue with the three painted surfaces. He said that the unpainted surface at 100 E. Main St. is a later addition and is not historic. Mr. Evans agreed that it is a later addition. Mr. Frederick said that it is an alley and is not a part of the primary façade. He said that the position of the mural is as important at the material. Mr. Auchey said that he would prefer the mural be painted on the brick surface instead of a bolted on structure.

Mrs. Gingrich said that she is concerned with the size of the murals and that they could take over the downtown area. She reference the sign on the Ross building takes over downtown. Mr. Frederick pointed to other old cities that have murals that are five-stories tall. Mrs. Gingrich said that she thinks those are too large as well. Mr. Frederick said that these surfaces can always be repainted and that he is fine with all of them. Mr. Phillips said that he thinks that walls always look better with murals. Mr. Auchey made a motion to approve the application as submitted; Mr. Phillips seconded. Mrs. Gingrich asked if they have any say over the content of the murals. Mr. Frederick said that they do not.

Public Comment: None

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Mr. Auchey**
Second: **Mr. Phillips**
Vote: **6-1, Mrs. Gingrich voting nay.**

In parting, it was confirmed that the applicant will not need to come back to the commission to get approval or comments on the designs.

Case #26-09 – 106 Elizabeth St. – Addition – Rear Stair Replacement

Ms. Liberto read the staff report. The structure had not been determined contributing. Mr. Auchey went through the checklist. Mr. Auchey made a motion to determine the structure **contributing**.

Public Comment: None

Motion and Vote: No motion, application incomplete.
Motion: **Matt Auchey**
Second: **Lisa Gingrich**
Vote: **Unanimous**

Ms. Liberto finished the staff report. The applicant said that they need to replace the stairs for safety. She said that she is okay with replacing the railings with wood. Mr. Auchey said that he has no issues and the fact that the applicant is okay with wood railings makes it easier. Mr.

Auchey made a motion to approve the application with the amendment that the railings will be wood. Mr. Phillips seconded.

Public Comment: None

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Mr. Auchey**
Second: **Mr. Phillips**
Vote: **Unanimous**

Case #26-10 – 303 South Blvd. – Addition – Fence

Ms. Liberto read the staff report. The structure had not been determined. Mr. Auchey read through the checklist. He made a motion to determine the structure contributing. Mrs. Gingrich seconded.

Public Comment: None

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Mr. Auchey**
Second: **Mrs. Gingrich**
Vote: **Unanimous**

Ms. Liberto finished the staff report. The applicant stated that they had no idea that they were in the historic district and needed to get approval. They have other vinyl fences near their backyard. Mr. Frederick said that this specific house was from an era where vinyl fences were more common. Mr. DaSilva said that the type of fence flows with the house. Mr. Auchey said that they normally deny vinyl fences but this house is unique. He said that it is so far back that they cannot see it. Mr. Frederick agreed that the type of house makes it more acceptable. He said that if they had come before constructing it, he would have approved it. Mrs. Gingrich asked how long the visible stretch of fence is. She said that the part that they have not yet built will be very visible. The applicant replied that the foliage will obscure it from view. Mr. Evans asked how much space will be between the fences and who will maintain it. They said that they will use a weedwhacker to maintain the area. Mr. Phillips agreed with everything Mr. Frederick said. Mr. Phillips motioned to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Auchey seconded.

Public Comment: None

Motion and Vote:
Motion: **Mr. Phillips**
Second: **Mr. Auchey**
Vote: **5-2, Mrs. Lawson and Mrs. Gingrich voting nay.**

Mr. Phillips asked a question about a project on his property at 401 Pennsylvania Avenue. He has a garage that is about to fall apart and he needs to repair it. He wants to reface it, redo the roof, and wants to get rid of the man doors. He asked if they need to vote on whether the garage is contributing. Mr. Auchey said that if he is changing it, he has to come before them.

Adjournment:
There being no further business, **Mr. Evans** moved to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by **Mr. Phillips**, which was brought to a vote and approved unanimously.

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 Department of Infrastructure and Development.

Brenden Frederick SL
Brenden Frederick, Acting Chairman

10/14/2026
Date

Henry Pearson SL
Henry Pearson, Associate Planner

10/14/2026
Date