CITY OF CONWAY
COMMUNITY APPEARANCE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2016
CITY HALL CONFERENCE ROOM – 229 MAIN STREET – 4:00 P.M.

Present: Jason Pippin, Danny Clonts, Heather Whitley, Paul Doyle, Brenda Ivester
Absent: George Ulrich
Staff: Jessica Hucks, Zoning Officer; Barbara Tessier, Secretary
Others: Woody Richardson, Allison Rivitsky; Mark Timbes; Jean Timbes

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 24, 2016 MINUTES

Whitley made a motion, seconded by Doyle, to approve the August 24, 2016 meeting minutes as written. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

III. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

A. Horry Furniture Co., Inc.: The applicant, J. Charley Ray, requests approval to demolish the residential structure located at 611 Main Street (TMS: 137-02-13-019 / PIN: 33813030034).

Hucks said there were criteria for demolition/relocation of structures within their prevue; one of them being that there were definite plans for the use of the property. Hucks said she had not been made aware of any plans for the property post-demolition.

Hucks said staff had no issues with the house being demolished.

Clonts asked if the wall would stay in place. Richardson said the wall was owned by the state and would not be removed by him.

Doyle asked why the applicant wanted to demolish the structure. Richardson said it was in poor shape. He said the structure was rotted.

Pippin asked if it was a safety issue to have it removed. Richardson said it was and that would be over $100,000 to repair it.

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

B. Horry Furniture Co., Inc.: The applicant, J. Charley Ray, requests approval to demolish the residential structure located at 1507 Main Street (TMS: 123-13-02-004 / PIN: 33811020037).
Hucks said the same criteria applied to this request as did to the last one. She said she was not aware of any plans for the property post-demolition.

Clonts asked if the structure was occupied. Richardson said no one lived in the structure at this time. He said there were electrical issues among other structural issues.

Doyle made a motion, seconded by Whitley, to approve the demolition of the structure as requested. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

Item C and D were moved to the end of the meeting as there was no present for them at the time.

C.  **Anderson Brothers Bank:** The applicant, Garvin Design Group, requests approval for an addition to the existing bank at 500 Main Street, along with several site improvements and exterior renovations. (TMS: 137-02-06-010 / PIN: 33813030016).

Hucks said this item had previously been seen by the Board. To recap, the applicant proposed to add a 1,000 sq. ft. addition to the north side of the existing bank (Anderson Bros. Bank), which is also located on a corner lot. Per the application, a new vestibule entry and new site work will better accommodate the vehicular traffic and increase pedestrian safety. Work proposed includes landscaping, Stormwater improvements, a pedestrian path to the public sidewalk, a drive-up teller area, new vestibule entrance, rear addition and other cosmetic improvements such as canopies, metal roofing and exterior paint. Parking areas will also be reworked and come into compliance with the requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance.

She said there were not many changes, but there was a change to the rear elevations. She said they were adding steps off the rear (east) elevation that were not proposed before.

Mark Times said the project was being reviewed by the TRC at this time. He said the building behind the bank would be demolished under a separate permit requested by Anderson Brothers Bank.

Whitley asked if the oak tree (front) would remain. Timbes said the tree would be staying. Clonts made a motion, seconded by Whitley, to approve the request as presented. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

D.  **CCNB (Coastal Carolina National Bank):** The applicant, Tyson Sign Co., requests approval to install a wall sign and window/door graphics on the front façade of the building located at 1106 Third Ave for CCNB (TMS: 137-02-03-008 / PIN: 36804020105).

Hucks said this request was for CCNB, a new bank located in the same tenant space formerly occupied by Vista Bank. The applicant requested approval for an 8' x 2' (10 sq. ft.) sandblasted wall sign and address panel (above wall sign) She said while the building façade measurements were not provided; the sign was relatively the same size as the one for Vista Bank and was compliant with the
size requirements for wall signage of the UDO. The wall sign would have raised copy, graphics and border with a sandblasted background. Colors would include a blue background, green logo, and white letters and border. The address panel would be blue with a white border and numbers (1106).

Hucks said also proposed are window/door graphics. Door graphics are approx. .58 sq. ft. in total size and a dusted crystal color. Window graphics proposed are approx. .52 sq. ft. and will be white vinyl. Both are consistent with the UDO.

The representative for Tyson sign was present, but the Board had no questions for her.

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

E. **JHAZ Soaps**: The applicant, Jeffrey Bieniek, requests approval to install a wall sign, add window graphics and install two goose-neck outdoor lights to the building located at 324 Main Street, and is also requesting to paint the portions of the façade that are wood to a metallic gray color, as well as add two (2) white benches in front of the building windows out front (TMS: 137-02-01-018 / PIN: 36701010030).

*The applicant(s) were not present, however the board moved forward with considering the request.*

Hucks said the wall sign would include colors of bluish-green (or teal), black lettering and white border/graphics. The applicant also proposed to install two (2) metallic gray goose-neck lights above the proposed walls sign for external illumination. Although Board approval not required, the applicant would also be putting two (2) potted plants and two (2) white benches outside the front of the tenant space.

Hucks said there were 8 windows and two glass doors to which graphics would be applied. She said the background for these graphics would be gray with white lettering and teal graphics.

Hucks said the request for the wall sign was consistent with both the requirements of the UDO and the HDRD Guidelines. With regard to the window/door graphics, while consistent with the requirements of the UDO, it did not meet the suggestions stated in the HDRD Guidelines with respect to placement on the windows/doors. The guidelines state that “in display windows, the outside perimeter of subordinate signs should be placed within 2.5-ft. inward from the entry side frame of the window glass and the top perimeter of the sign within 2.5-ft. up from the bottom display sill (it may be centered adjacent to display windows with top perimeter of the sign within 2.5-ft. up from the bottom display sill). As presented, the window graphics sit just below the top of the sill of each pane, which is inconsistent with the guidelines (Section 6.3). Hucks said that with regard to the glass doors, the HDRD Guidelines suggests that “on entry doors, subordinate signs should either be centered or set to the
bottom portion of the door panel glass." As presented, the proposed graphics/signage is located on the upper portion of the door glass panel. Hucks said that she had emailed the applicant and suggested that they may want to remove the gray background from the window/door graphics in order to achieve transparency, make the graphics appear more "centered" on the windows, and also not obscure the top portion of the door panes as much, or to move the proposed door signage to the bottom portion of the glass door panes to be compliant with the Guidelines. In a reply email, the applicant explained that they were trying to make the products they offer more visible to vehicular traffic and having the graphics centered would block some of their display they plan to have. They also wanted the metallic gray background of the graphics to accent the color in the wall sign as well as the light fixtures and building façade that they propose to paint gray. The portion of building façade that they propose to pain metallic gray was above the entrance around the decorative (white) "boxes."

Doyle said the windows were meant for pedestrian traffic and that other storefronts along Main Street had the same traffic issues. He suggested they approve everything except the window signage until the applicant could be present. Another Board member suggested that the applicants should move the graphics all the way to the top of the windows/doors so that there was continuity to the signs and also achieved what the applicant was looking to do. Hucks suggested, if the Board was amenable to it, to approve everything, as presented, with the exception of the window/door graphics in their current location, unless the applicants were either in agreement to adhere to the HDRD Guidelines regarding placement of window/door graphics, OR if they chose to move the graphics all the way to the top of the window/door panes, as suggested.

Doyle made a motion, seconded by Clonts, to approve the wall sign, the lighting, the painting of the wood façade and the benches and the window/door graphics on the condition that they window/door graphics be placed where the HDRD guidelines suggested or be placed at the top of the window/door panes to achieve maximum transparency, or to come back before the board for further consideration. The vote in favor was unanimous. The motion carried.

IV. BOARD INPUT

There was none.

V. STAFF INPUT

There was none.

VI. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

Approved and signed this 28 day of Sept, 2016.

Jason Pippin, Chairman