CAB
May 8, 2019

CITY OF CONWAY
COMMUNITY APPEARANCE BOARD MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2019
CITY HALL CONFERENCE ROOM – 229 MAIN STREET – 4:00 P.M.

Present: Heather Whitley, Troy Roehm, Matt Richardson, Brenda Ivester

Absent: Jason Pippin, Sheila Walberg-O’Neil, Craig Smith

Staff: Jessica Hucks, Zoning Administrator; Alicia Shelley, Secretary; Taylor Newell, Public Information Officer

Other: Jamie McLain, Anthony Edwards, Katie Powell

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Whitley called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Roehm made a motion to accept the minutes as written and it was seconded by Ivester to approve the April 10, 2019 minutes. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

III. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS


Hucks stated that final approval was granted on this project back in December, 2017. In April, 2018, the applicant requested some changes to the approved project, including roofing, limestone cladding, window frame color, the landscape plan and the front step elevation. The Board (CAB) approved the requested changes. One of those revisions was the deletion of the steps on the front elevation of the building. According to the applicant, they would be unable to get approval from the SCDOT to encroach into the Main Street right-of-way by constructing a new set of steps, connected to the steps that were originally proposed. Additionally, the proposed steps and railing encroached into the front yard setback. The applicant revised their elevations to eliminate the steps and have railing across the front.

Hucks then said that he applicant now wishes to install steps, as originally proposed, with one difference being that they wish to install brick pavers that would connect to the existing steps onto Main Street.
Additionally, the steps they propose to install will be comprised of the same brick that is on the building instead of the concrete steps originally proposed. Because the proposed steps (and railing) exceeds 12” in height, they are required to meet the setbacks of the zoning district. The applicant received a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals at their April 25th meeting for the proposed (4-5”) encroachment. Because it differs from what this board last reviewed and approved, subsequent review and approval of the proposed changes is required.

Anthony Edwards, applicant further explained the request. He stated that the steps will be the same brick as the building and will connect with a winding sidewalk made of brick pavers to tie into the retaining wall that already exists on Main Street.

The board discussed the request and attempted to find other options.

Ivester made a motion, seconded by Richardson, to approve the request as presented. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

B. **Peanut Warehouse – 150 Laurel Street:** The applicant, Jamie McLain, requests approval for renovations at the Peanut Warehouse, located at 150 Laurel Street (PIN: 367-01-01-0058).

Hucks stated that the applicant requested approval for renovations proposed at the Peanut Warehouse in order to weatherize the building. These renovations include: (1) Exterior siding will be replaced with 1x8 Cypress and the trim will be 1x6 Cypress. Wood will be left natural to age; and (2) Windows: windows proposed to be re-glazed and sills will be replaced.

Hucks reminded the board that this building was approved for vinyl window replacement 3 years ago but the work was never done.

Jamie McLain, applicant further added that the cypress siding will be placed over the existing boards to weatherize the building. It will be left natural. The interior will be left as it exists today. The windows will be a composite exterior that come in different colors and wood on the inside. The top windows on the building would just be repaired.

The board had concerns with the historic buildings. McLain stated that SHPO is ok with the weatherization and it is within the guidelines of the State History and Archives.

McLain said they are only covering the holes on the building and are replacing the pine with cypress which should last much longer and never rot. He stated that it would take probably 3-4 years for the new siding to weather completely but that is would start weathering immediately upon being installed.

After much discussion, they decided to bring the windows back before the board at a later time when a sample is available.
Hucks read the part of the Community Appearance Guidelines (Section E, Ch. 10: 10.4. WRD Buildings’ Exterior Cladding, Siding & Cladding (Historic vs. New)) that talks about the exterior cladding, siding, and clapboard materials for new construction (& refinished) WRD siding material, which says the features include the following:

- Wood clapboard siding (generally large reveals 8-14 inches)
- Very little overlap (for efficiency of replacing material and air)
- Unfinished surfaces (or once “whitewashed” with natural coatings)
- Structures have both equal and irregular reveal and board length
- Knotty wood and quarter-sewn materials
- Additions were not blended & siding materials simply change at vertical divisions (often material stripped was used in new section)
- Exterior clapboard walls without insulation & installation (with required historic “reversibility”) will take creativity
- Lack of corner boards

The board then discussed with the applicant ways to make the building look distressed sooner, or ways to expedite the weatherization process. Jamie McLain stated he would research methods and was willing to come back before the Board prior to installing the siding with a final finish.

Roehm made a motion to approve the request for weatherizing the building with cypress siding over the existing siding and for the final finish be resubmitted to the board prior to installation of the siding and that the windows also come back before the board at a later date. Ivester seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Costa Bowls – 412 Main Street: The applicant, Christopher Smith, requests approval for wall signage and window/door graphics for the building located at 412 Main Street (TMS: 137-02-06-024 | PIN: 338-13-03-0022).

Hucks stated that the applicant proposes to install a wall sign as well as window and door graphics at 412 Main Street for “Costa Bowls”. She read the dimensions and material of each sign as follows:

Wall Sign:

- *Pineapple Relic*. Measures 1.67 (h) x 1’ (w), totaling 1.67 sq. ft. in sign area. The material is acrylic.
- *Costa Bowls panel*: Measures 1.5’ (h) x 6’ (w), totaling 9 sq. ft. in sign area. Sign panel is white DiBond board attached to the storefront. There will be a silver fastener at each corner. Half-inch (1/2") black acrylic letters will be attached to the sign panel (white) to add dimension.
- Total wall sign area: 10.67 sq. ft. and is in compliance with the sign area limitations of the UDO.
Window Graphics (front-facing windows):

- Windows measure 2.59' (w) x 5.84' (h), totaling 15.13 sq. ft. Max coverage is 25%, allowing a coverage of 3.79 sq. ft. maximum.
  - Graphics ("SUPER" "FRUIT" "BOWLS") measure (approx.) 1.67' (w) x .42' (h), totaling .71 sq. ft. for each line of text. There are 3 lines of text on each of the two front-facing windows. Total sign area for each of the front facing windows: 2.13 sq. ft. (each window). Graphics are white vinyl.

Window Graphics (angled windows):

- Windows measure 4.25' (w) x 5.84' (h), totaling 24.82 sq. ft. Max coverage is 25%, allowing a coverage of 6.21 sq. ft. maximum.
  - Graphics (Costa Bowls logo) measure approx. 1.5' x 1.5', totaling 2.25 sq. ft. (for each of the two angled windows). Logo is white vinyl.

Door graphics:

- Door (glass) measures 3.09' (w) x 6.37' (h), totaling 19.59 sq. ft. Max coverage is 50%, allowing a coverage of 9.8 sq. ft. maximum.
  - Graphics are situated on a portion of the bottom of the door glass. Graphics are lime green/white in color. They do not exceed 50% in coverage of the glass.

The applicant was not present.

The board had concerns with the pineapple material and the wall sign fasteners that were located on each corner of the wall sign.

Richardson made a motion to defer the request until the next meeting when the applicant is present. Ivester seconded the motion. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

IV. PUBLIC INPUT

None

V. BOARD INPUT

Roehm had concerns with Kingston Park regarding the tables, umbrellas and the brick knee wall not connecting to the buildings on Main Street. Hucks stated that she will check with Wanda and report back to the board.

VI. STAFF INPUT

None

The next meeting is May 22, 2019.
VII. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, Roehm made a motion that was seconded by Ivester, to adjourn the meeting at 5:03 p.m. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

Approved and signed this 22\textsuperscript{nd} day of May, 2019.

Heather Whitley, Chairman
Troy Roehm, Vice-Chairman