CITY OF CONWAY
COMMUNITY APPEARANCE BOARD MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2017
CITY HALL CONFERENCE ROOM – 229 MAIN STREET – 4:00 P.M.

Present: Jason Pippin, Danny Clonts, Paul Doyle, Heather Whitley
Absent: George Ulrich, Brenda Ivester
Staff: Jessica Hucks, Zoning Officer; Barbara Tessier, Secretary
Others: Scott Thompson; Elaine Sivret, Gerry Wallace, Derrick Mozingo,
Debbie Jenkins

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman Pippin called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 11, 2017 MINUTES

III. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

A. Peanut Warehouse – Scott Thompson, applicant, requests approval to replace the roof of the Peanut Warehouse, located at 150 Laurel Street (TMS# 137-06-22-004 / PIN: 36701010001).

Hucks said Thompson wanted to replace the shingled roof that was currently on the building with a tin roof. She said staff could not verify whether the shingle roof was the original material, how she said the HDRD Guidelines did recognize that some of the buildings along the Waccamaw Riverfront as having metal or tin roofs. Article A (Approval Matrix) of the HDRD Guidelines allow for roof replacement to be approved administratively, but because the Peanut Warehouse is identified as being within the Waccamaw River Warehouse Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places, staff felt it warranted a full review by the Board.

Hucks said the National Park Services website for the US Dept. of Interior provided some architectural information regarding the Peanut Warehouse warehouse, but that it did not mention the roof material.

Thompson said at least two other building along the river had tin roofs. He said the shingles were blown off during Hurricane Matthew.

Doyle asked Hucks since the property was on the Register did it have to be replaced with the original materials. Hucks read from the US Dept. of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. She said since there was no way to verify what the
original roof material was, the Board could determine if replacing the shingles with tin was appropriate.

Thompson said he wanted to preserve what he could. He said in the case of the windows, the contractor moved the windows that could be saved to the front of the building and that he had then constructed new windows out of old wood. Doyle asked Thompson what the color of the roof would be. Thompson said it would not have a color. He said shingles would be less expensive, but he wanted the tin, which he felt would fit in and require less maintenance.

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

B. **The Skillet Downtown** – A1 Signs & Graphics, applicant, requests approval to install two wall signs, as well as window and door graphics for “The Skillet Downtown,” located at 1129 Third Ave (TMS# 137-06-19-012 / PIN: 36804020053).

Hucks said this was the location of the former Mason Jar Deli and presented the proposed signage to the Board, which included two wall signs, and window & door graphics.

Sivret said the signage was the same size and locations of those that had been there for the Mason Jar.

Hucks said the signage met the requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance and had no concerns with the proposed signage.

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

C. **Char’s Candy & More** – A1 Signs & Graphics, applicant, requests approval to install a hanging bracket/suspended sign underneath the awning for “Char’s Candy & More,” located at 315 Main Street (TMS# 137-02-02-022 / PIN: 36702020033).

Hucks presented the request to the board, and being that it was compliant with the UDO, staff has no concerns with the request. Whitley asked why it did not have a dimensional appearance. Hucks said that the Guidelines suggested that signs have a dimensional appearance, however with regard to hanging bracket signs, it has not been commonplace in recent years to require dimension for the smaller pedestrian-driven signs as much so as was required for wall signage. She added it would be within the board’s purview whether they wanted to require that with this sign. There may be future signage forthcoming for the establishment that would have the dimensional requirements that would serve as the business’s primary sign, but at this time, no wall signage was proposed.

Hucks added that the hanging bracket sign would need to meet a clearance of at least 8-ft above the ROW or sidewalk area below.
Doyle made a motion, seconded by Clonts, to approve the request as presented. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

IV. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW


Hucks said the property was located in the Upper Main Street Corridor Overlay (MSO) and the Main Street HDRD. She said Section 6.5.1(C).2 Upper Main Street Corridor Overlay (MSO) states, “Non-residential uses permitted by the underlying zoning shall maintain a single-family detached residential appearance, either through the use of existing residential structures or new structures.” She continued that there was no actual criteria for what single-family was to look like.

She added that there was a parcel to the real of this property that was going to be purchased and combined with this one in order to accommodate the parking, as parking is required to be located in the rear, per the Upper Main Street Overlay in the UDO.

Mozingo said their plan was to construct a traditional historic office building. He said the large oak tree in the tree of the property would be preserved. He said there would be the appropriate buffering between this newly combined parcel and the residential parcel adjacent at the rear.

Mozingo said they would be using a rusticated brick for the exterior the building, which gives the brick a rustic appearance.

Hucks said this proposed building did fall in line with the museum that was across the street from it. She said the Board should keep in mind the style of the surrounding buildings.

Pippin asked how big the building would be. Mozingo said it was a two-story building with 3,000 sq. ft. per floor. Pippin said that would be a great addition to that corner, and would fit in well with the museum.

Pippin asked Mozingo what the timeframe was. Mozingo said they would like to start as soon as possible.

The requests for the following two agenda items were misidentified by the applicant for conceptual review, and were actually seeking final review and approval.

B. Anderson Brothers Bank – Tyson Sign Co., applicant, requests approval to install a tenant panel in an existing blade sign as well as a new wall sign for a temporary Anderson Bros. Bank location, at 315 Main Street (TMS# 137-02-02-022 / PIN: 36701010022).
Hucks said Anderson Brothers Bank was setting up a call center in one of the tenant spaces in the building located at 315 Main St. She said the tenant panel for the Main Street side hanging bracket sign did not need CAB review, as the structure was previously approved, and as such, could be approved administratively.

Hucks said they had also requested to install a wall sign at the rear of the building, which had been removed from their 500 Main Street building. She said it would be reworked for this new location. The original request had been for internal illumination, however, this type of signage is prohibited in the Central Business District (CBD). In addition, the Commercial HDRD discourages internally lit signage. If the applicant had wanted to pursue the internally lit cabinet sign, they would have had to apply for a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. The applicant had since revised the sign to not be internally lit.

Hucks said the signage did not have the appearance of dimension, but it would not be visible from Main Street.

Doyle said there were maybe 5 parking spaces in the rear for public use so why were they going put it up. Jenkins said it was another public entrance.

Doyle made a motion, seconded by Clonts, to approve as presented. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

C. Anderson Brothers Bank – Tyson Sign Co., applicant, requests approval to install two wall signs, one new monument sign and three directional signs for Anderson Bros. Bank, at their 500 Main Street location (TMS #137-02-06-010 / PIN: 33813030017).

Hucks said the bank was currently renovating and constructing an addition to this property. She said the wall signs would be on the front and rear of the building, the monument sign would be installed on the Main Street side, and several directional signs would be installed on the Fifth Ave entrance and internal to the rear parking area.

Hucks said internal illumination was not permitted in the zoning district where this property was located. She said the proposed wall signage was not considered a cabinet sign, but instead channel letters that had a halo effect.

Jenkins said the wall signage was individual letters, not channel letters on a raceway, and that the lighting was behind the letters and not in the actual letters.

Hucks said the ordinance did not specify the type of cabinet was permitted; just that internally illuminated cabinets were prohibited, so the monument sign was revised to exclude internal illumination. Since revised, it was in compliance with the UDO requirements. The monument sign would be an aluminum cabinet.

Hucks said the monument sign could not impede the sight triangle, and would need to meet a 5-ft. setback from the property lines, as well as have a 5-ft.
landscape buffer installed around the base of the sign. Jenkins confirmed the
sign would comply with those requirements.

Hucks said the directional signage would also be aluminum cabinet signs and
would have white reflective vinyl lettering.

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

V. BOARD INPUT

There was none.

VI. STAFF INPUT

Hucks said at the last meeting, the Board had asked her to research to see if
they had the authority to keep public input to five (5) minutes. Hucks said there
was nothing official, but that staff agreed that the chairman could announce at
any meeting that individual input would be limited to five minutes per person.

VII. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting
adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Approved and signed this 8th day of February, 2017.

George Ulrich, Chairman