CITY OF CONWAY
COMMUNITY APPEARANCE BOARD MEETING
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2012
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – 4 P.M.

Present: Brooke David, George Ulrich, Robert Miller, Danny Clonts
Absent: Amber Wall, Jason Pippin, Robert Harper
Staff: Joe Henderson, Zoning Administrator; Barbara Tessier, Secretary
Others: Michael Harrelson, Jerry Johnson, A-1 Signs and Graphics; Eric Branton, Ronnie Branton, C&R Builders; Alan Matthews, Wedge Car Wash

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman David called the meeting to order at 4:11 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ulrich made a motion, seconded by Clonts, to approve the October 10, 2012 meeting minutes as written. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

C. DESIGN REVIEWS

1. Waccamaw Shrine Club – Mr. Jerry Johnson, applicant, requests approval of landscape plan approval and the relocation of the property’s dumpster pad at 10 Elm Street. (TMS# 137-00-02-001)

Henderson said this was the formal approval of the landscape plan and the relocation of the dumpster. He showed an aerial photograph that showed the current dumpster pad. He said they wanted to relocate it across the parking lot underneath a group of trees. He said it would be easier access for the City’s Solid Waste collection. He said the dumpster site would be brought up to code, which included a 30’ concrete pad with bollards and surrounded by screening. He said he thought they were proposing a vinyl screening at 7’ in height.

Miller asked if vinyl allowed in the district. Henderson there was not much description of what was or what wasn’t allowed in the Waccamaw Riverfront District. He said there was only section that said, “Vegetative buffers and screening around grouped dumpsters or corrals could be constructed of either wood or lattice-work brick walls for ventilation.” He said there was vinyl in the district. Ulrich thought the city had something in vinyl at the riverfront. Miller agreed. Clonts said with the wall it would be invisible from all sides except from coming into the parking lot.
Miller asked if there would be landscaping around the dumpster. Henderson asked Johnson if they were proposing to landscape around it. Miller said even pampass grass would be fine. Miller said he would be inclined to permit the vinyl if there was landscaping around it. Johnson said they had been talking about using the Knockout roses. Henderson asked how many should be required. Miller said it should be 3 gallon Knockout roses every 5’. Henderson said it was every 4’-5’ apart.

Miller made a motion, seconded by Clonts, to approve the submitted landscape plan as approved by the Tree Board, and also to approve the vinyl dumpster enclosure so long as the property owner installed three gallon Knockout roses spaced every 4’-5’ to match the landscape plan on the opposite side of the building. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

2. **American Dental – Jerry Johnson, applicant, requests approval of one primary wall and one freestanding sign at 1515 Main Street.**
(TMS# 123-13-02-003)

Mike Harrelson stated his name for the record.

Henderson said this request was for a property in the Main Street Corridor and within the Upper Main Street Overlay and is zoned Professional (P). He said the signs met the size requirements.

Henderson said staff recommended approval of the wall signage, and recommended the post sign complied with Sections 11.4.6 and 11.4.7 the UDO. He said these sections require if the sign was deemed a monument sign it not exceed 24 sq. ft., which it did, 8 ft. in height, and shall be designed so that they style of the sign and its base are consistent with the architecture of the building.

Henderson said that he believed the owner had several different colors that he was proposing – red and black. Harrelson said the first choice was red, white, and blue. He said they were going to have black shutters on the building. Henderson showed pictures of the current construction saying they had used a reddish brick with scalloped hardi plank in the gable.

Miller said if signs were allowed to have a shape. He thought there was something previously that was proposed as a shape and it was not permitted. Henderson said under UDO’s Prohibited Signs section, Section 11.2.2 stated that “No sign, sign structure, or attention seizing device shall be shaped in the form of a statute of human or animal figure, nor in the form of a three-dimensional model.” He said the examples given were a dinner bucket, paint cans, or Christmas trees. Henderson said the question with the tooth was whether or not the tooth was three-dimensional or two-dimensional. Harrelson said it could be looked at both ways. He said the box itself 18” thick. Harrelson said the tooth would be an outline of a tooth and said it had no depth. Harrelson referred to several areas of the sign.
Henderson said several years ago there had been a proposal for a sign with Adirondack chairs whose outline came off the top of the sign. Miller said the ordinance at the time did not permit that. He said he wanted to make sure they were not missing the same denial on this one. He said if that was a monument sign, the ordinance said it had to complement the building, and it would need to be a brick base. Miller said it would have to be a brick base and potentially the tooth would not be allowed according to the ordinance. Henderson said that had been staff's interpretation. Harrelson said he did not think the owner would object to a brick base.

Harrelson showed a few photographs of other signs. Henderson thanked Harrelson for the examples, but they were permitted under the old zoning ordinance. He said this provision requiring that the bases be consistent with the architecture of the building was a new provision within the UDO.

Miller asked Harrelson if the wall signage was going to say American Dentist or just Dentist. Harrelson said it was just going to say Dentist.

Miller said he would be okay with the tooth if it had the brick base. He said the tooth would look better sitting on a brick base.

David said she did not know about the teeth on the wall sign. Miller asked if the wall sign met the ordinance. Henderson said it met the size requirements. Henderson said aesthetically it was just another piece of the wall sign or logo.

Henderson asked Johnson if he had any idea how he would work in the brick base. Henderson asked if there would be an area for plantings around it. Harrelson showed where the sign would be going. He said there were already shrubs. Johnson asked if there was a problem with straight lining it. Miller said it would have to be straight lined and the box itself would sit on top of the base. Miller said he didn’t really care for the teeth on the wall signage. Miller asked why it couldn’t just say American Dental and not have the teeth. Miller asked if there wasn’t something in the ordinance that said you couldn’t say what your business actually was. Henderson said that was removed, on the recommendation of the city attorney. Miller asked if the owner would be amenable if they gave him the tooth on the monument sign, and took the teeth off the wall signage and just have American Dental for the wall signage. Harrelson said he thought the owner would be fine with that. David said American Dental said dentist.

Miller made a motion, seconded by Ulrich, to approve the proposed monument sign with the exception of removing the red base and replacing it with a brick base to match the building, in any area of the box sign that was between the sign and the brick base as black to match the trim around the sign, and to approve the building sign with the following conditions, 1) the teeth are removed and 2) give the building owner the option to have it say either “Dentist” or “American Dental.” The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.
3. Oh Sew Cute Boutique – Nicholas Woodle, applicant, requests approval of one primary hanging sign for the front façade of 1020-A Fourth Avenue. (TMS# 137-02-05-007)

No representative was present.

4. Salvation Army Family Store – Louie Welch, applicant, requests approval of secondary window signage on front and side entrance doors at 1029 Third Avenue. (TMS# 137-02-20-001)

No representative was present.

5. Wedge Carwash – Planning Department staff requests review and approval of proposed structural and exterior siding modifications for an existing commercial construction located within the Gateway Corridor Overlay located at 2918 Church Street. (TMS# 122-07-01-058)

Ronnie Branton stated his name for the record.

Henderson said Branton was present to discuss the redesign of the Wedge Carwash. Henderson said this was located in the Highway Commercial zoning district within the Gateway Corridor Overlay. He said typically this was a Planning staff review. He said Planning staff did review it, but they were charged with insuring that each project met the conditions of the Architectural Design Standards in Section 6.3.1. He said after reviewing the materials, staff felt the redesign of the project did not meet several sections of the Design Standards.

Henderson said he would talk about the plans that had initially been sent to him. Branton said he had a new set. Henderson said he had built his issue paper from. He said they would then go into what Branton had brought to the meeting.

Henderson said the materials initially proposed were metal, but metal was not allowed by the Design Standards under UDO Section 6.3.1 (Non-Residential Architectural Design Standards). He said that under Section 6.3.1(C)- 3, 4, 8 and 10; staff did not feel the changes were appropriate based on what was proposed to be left from the original architecture. He explained that staff felt that the existing structure was a “Florida Cracker” architectural style, consisting of a wood frame construction with a metal roof, and a large front porch with a dormer over the central entrance. He showed the original elevations with the large front porch going across the entire front, dormer, pitched roof coming out toward the front with a standing seam metal roof. Branton said it was not standing seam. Henderson said then it was just overlapping metal.

Henderson said what was proposed initially, was a request to maintain a continuous roof pitch, which would extend from the front plain of the new storefront, after the porch was removed, all the way to the rear elevation. He said the intent was to
be able to see the vehicles moving through the center of the building. He said staff felt because the side and rear elevations were staying the same architectural style and the front was changing substantially, they wanted to defer this design review to the CAB. He said staff wanted to be sure that the changes were consistent with the standards of 6.3.1.

Henderson asked Branton if he wanted to explain the new design. Branton said staff had said there was too much difference on the side windows compared to the front. He said they went back and took the grills out of the windows and put bars in like the front elevations. He said they changed the windows so they would all be the same. He said they had a strip sign down the center of the building on three side of the building. He said they could not put the signage around the back because of the elevation of the roof. He said he had colors and samples of all the materials.

Henderson asked if this design was standard for other Wedge Carwash facilities. Branton said it was the theme. He said it was supposed to look like a wedge. He said they were using the same materials as were there now, but changing the roof pitch to look like a wedge.

Miller asked what the proposed building materials were for the sides. Branton said hardi plank siding. Miller asked what the material was for the area breaking the two sections of storefront windows. Branton said they would use a T-111 just to break it up. Miller asked if the spandrel would also be T-111. Branton said that was correct. Miller said that was where he was getting a little lost. He said he personally did not mind the shape of the building. He said the new proposed design was much better than what was originally proposed. He said he was not sure about the siding materials. He said he was not sure in terms of the contemporary design, which was what it was, with the coloring. He said the coloring wanted to be metal siding not the hardi board. He said the T-111 was an immensely inexpensive material generally used for cheap siding on sheds. He said if the they were going to do a contemporary design he said they should have more contemporary materials as opposed to the materials that were being proposed as siding. Branton asked what Miller suggested. Miller said he was more of contemporary person, a contemporary architect, even though the Board was here to preserve historicisms. He said buildings like this had a certain place as well. He said in terms of a carwash with this type of design, he would propose metal siding. He said he knew it was not allowed in the ordinance, but he said that was a point of contention in the ordinance as well. He said they could some of the area and the spandrel with 5/16 hardi panels. Branson said he didn't necessarily mean T-111. He said it would be something like hardi. Miller said the hardi panels could be painted with a high gloss finish. He said the high gloss finish would start to add to the contemporary design. He said that could balance out with the clear anodized aluminum frames.

Miller said in terms of the overall mass, it could still be done with hardi panels and do the hardi batten board and batten and do it horizontally. He said if it was done right, it could still have the contemporary look to it using traditional materials. He said
there were ways to use the materials permitted in the ordinance in a contemporary way that could be approved. Henderson said using a substitute material to get the look of the metal siding would be completely acceptable. He said at this point, he could not issue a building permit for metal siding. He said City Council was currently considering metal panel systems, but not overlapped sheet metal.

Miller said if they took the board and batten material and used it horizontally, they still got the striated look they had on the elevation. Branton said what was on the elevation was hardi board. Miller asked if it was hardi siding. Branton said it was. Branton asked if the Board wanted it all done slick. Miller said the rendering was showing shadow lines, which mean it was a lap siding. He said hardi board didn’t make a siding that had that big a reveal to it. Branton said it was just a shadow. Branton said the building already had hardi board siding on it. He said they were trying to keep everything the same. Branton asked Henderson to show the pictures of the building as it current stood. Miller said the rendering was showing some kind of additional detail over the siding. He said it showed two colors. Branton said it was just a shadow from when he did the rendering. Branton said it was just lap sided. Miller said the rendering looked like a heavier gauge metal siding like what was being put on the airport.

Henderson asked Branton if the rear wall and the front wall going to have that angle. Branton said they could not go back and make already existing wall angled. Henderson said the walls would be straight. Miller said given that, he was not really sure what they were looking at. Branton said it was just a square building. He said the roof would be different. He said the guy who did the color rendering just happened to angle it.

Henderson said there was another canopy coming off the back. Branton said that was just a metal frame with a pitched roof. Henderson asked if it would stay. Branton said it would be moved away from the building.

Branton said his CAD program would not let him design odd lines. Henderson asked if they were planning to do the sign band the way it was shown on the rendering around the entire building. Branton said it would be on the front and two sides. He said they could not put it across the back because of the overhang. Henderson said any signage would have to be done in a separate package. He said they were not reviewing signage at this time.

Miller said he was much more interested in the color rendering. He said the building would still have the overhang and the sign band was not going to protrude out beyond the edge. Branton said a regular CAD program could not draw out things like that. Miller said an architect should have designed the building. Branton said the sign would stick out from the building a couple of inches all the way around. Miller said that was not what was being shown.
Miller asked Henderson what he was looking for from the Board. Miller said they were looking at so many things. Henderson said staff did not know whether the proposed design was consistent with the UDO standards of 6.3.1. He explained that the work had begun without a Building Permit being issued, which complicated the request. The dormer was removed and the front porch roof was removed. He said it was obvious that Branton wanted to move forward with the design. Branton said they had to because the man had to get his business opened. Henderson said the work began without permits. Branton said he would pay a fine for that if he had to. Branton said they had to approve the design. Henderson said city staff and also the CAB were all confused as to what was going to be the finished design for the building. He said they had two different renderings. He said what Branton seemed to be saying that neither of the designs was representative of what they would be building. He said they were picking up certain elements of the color rendering, but structurally staying the same as the original plans. Branton said the drawings were identical. Miller said the drawings were not the same. Brandon did not agree. He asked Miller to tell him what the differences were. Branton said the new rendering was just to show the color scheme. Henderson said that fact was not mentioned to the Board.

Allan Matthews stated his name for the record. He said there had been a mistake. He said the designer sent the wrong design. He described how it was going to look. Ulrich said they were going with the colors from the new rendering on the original structural plans. Matthews said that was correct. Miller said the walls would remain straight, the roof maintained the angle and it still had the overhang. Matthews said the overhang would be removed. Miller said the way it was designed right now it was a mix of traditional and contemporary building. He said from a architectural standpoint and a design standpoint the two styles did not match. Branton said that could be changed. Miller said he understood what they were trying to do structurally, and he appreciated why it was being done that way. He said it could be really interesting driving by and having the higher area with sunlight coming in and having the visibility. He said it worked better with the sign band projected out beyond the face of the building, not an inch or two but the 18-24" that it appeared to be scaled to. He said that made an immense difference to the look of the building. Matthew asked if Miller would prefer it to project out. Miller said he would.

Miller said he needed feedback since the Board did not review this zone. He did not know how the ordinance related to what the Board was suggesting. Henderson said the architectural standards was all there was. He said if they were proposing a transition from traditional to contemporary on the front, then they had to continue that on all elevations. He said he thought from what they were discussing, they could get there. He said he was trying to figure out how it could be permitted. He said some changes needed to be made to the renderings showing exactly what was going to be done, how they were going to incorporate what had been decided about the banding and the sign. He said once the changes were made, he would like to show them to the Board. He said they could do an email feedback by each Board member. Branton said he would make all the changes that evening. Henderson said there was only one meeting in both November and December and they did not want to hold them up that long. Henderson
said they did not give comfortable giving a solid approval based on the renderings. He said they needed to see something else.

Miller said the mix of traditional and contemporary design was going to look odd, but he said if the coloring was done right, had the blue banding, and doing the clear anodized frames against the color they had, it would look better. He said if they took away the traditional gable and matched the other one, it would help. He said they should hold the sign band back on each side and let the siding wrap around would help. Miller said he knew it did not seem like he was trying to help, but he truly was. Branton said he understood.

Henderson said in order to be able to issue a permit, he was going to require that the Board members see a final rendering that combined the elements and drop it onto the structure. He asked Branton if he could provide that to him. Branton said he would make the changes and have it to Henderson in the morning. Henderson said they should take their time with it. Henderson said he wanted to recap what had been talked about, what needed to be changed to the materials, the side elevations, the blue band and the roof line of the canopy, which he said he was a little confused about. Henderson said it was just a pitched roof consisting of a metal canopy, and they were saying they were going to bring that out in a wedge to match the principal structure. Branton said that was correct.

Miller asked about what was being shown as spandrel glass. He said that was glass over top of the siding material. He asked if they were okay with that instead of doing the break. Branton said he had to do the break. Miller said the break could still be done with the spandrel glass. He said the spandrel glass would just go over the top of the structure. He said the piece of glass in plan view and some type of material that gets painted on some type of substrate. He said they would have framing members and then whatever they had behind it. He said it would still read as glass. Branton said they were trying to put some type of skylights in the tunnel. Miller said the elevation showed glass and then stopping and then having siding. Miller said what he was saying was not to stop the glass. He said let the glass read all the way through. He said instead of siding there would be some type of smooth material that got painted. He said that was his first recommendation.

Miller said his second recommendation would be to maintain the blue sign band as shown in the rendering so that it did protrude from the building up to 24"-30", but then it would stop before it got to the back of the building. He said instead of doing the gables in the entry canopy into the carwash for the vehicles to do a roof that matched the building roof. He said he thought the colors were fine. There was discussion about the sign band being flat to the building. Miller said the rendering did not show it flat to the building along the front. Miller said there would be a shadow line all the way underneath it because it was out from the building. Miller said if the window frames were going back behind the sign band. Miller said the sign band could come off the building 6" all the way around. Miller also said instead of protruding the 24"-30" off the building, it could also protrude off 6".
David asked Henderson to clarify that Branton would email him a revised rendering. Henderson said that was correct. Miller said the rest of the Board had not voiced any input. Everyone agreed to defer to Miller’s suggestions. Henderson said he wanted Branton to explain how they were going to handle the canopy because he was still not sure how the band was going to come around with the canopy there. Branton said there was space in between. He said it was not one building, but two. Henderson was not sure it would meet the building codes having a second structure that close without being attached. Matthew said it had been there for 10 years. Miller said from a building code standpoint it was not a problem because it was not space that could be occupied. Henderson said he was not trying to throw a monkey wrench into the situation, however, he did not want to have gotten this far and have the Building Official say it could not be done.

A quick recap of what the Board expected to see on the new rendering was:

- **Materials**: The fiber cement (Hardy Board) should resemble the metal, in color and design;
- **Spandrel Panels**: Glass panels should break evenly the front elevations and be placed between the top and bottom front façade widows;
- **Sign Band**: A blue sign band should protrude a minimum of 6” from the front and side facades and wrap around the elevations;
- **Detailing Canopy**: The pitched roof on the canopy should be modified to mimic the wedge shape on the building.

D. PUBLIC INPUT

There was none.

E. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Approved and signed this 14th day of NOV., 2012.

[A. Brooke David]

Chairman, A. Brooke David