

**Board of Architectural Review Minutes
March 1st, 2022
Via Zoom Meeting**

Members Present:

Phil Dixon, Chairman
Dr. David Price, Vice Chairman
NancyJean Nettles
Rachel Burton
Jeff Bowers
Beth Huggins
Tim Kennedy

Members Absent:

Staff Present:

Becca Zimmerman, Planner II

Items on the agenda:

Old Business:

N/A

New Business:

1. **607 S. Main Street-** Addition to an existing single-family residence
2. **100 E. Carolina Avenue-** New construction of a single-family residence
3. **208 S. Cedar Street-** New construction of a mixed-use development

Miscellaneous:

1. N/A

Chairman Dixon opened the meeting at 6:07 pm and asked for consideration of the minutes from February 1st, 2022. The minutes were unanimously approved with edits sent in via e-mail to be made.

Old Business: N/A

New Business:

1. 607 S Main Street- Ms. Davidson presented her proposal for an owner's suite addition to her existing single-family residence. Ms. Zimmerman read letters from two neighboring property owners with concerns about existing flooding issues. Ms. Zimmerman confirmed that these items would be assessed at the time of permitting and were not within the BAR's purview. Ms. Davidson confirmed that the materials would match the existing home though it should be noted that some of the siding on the home was not of good quality. She stated at some point they would want to replace all of the siding with a quality Hardiplank or cementitious product. Mr. Kennedy made a motion to approve the project as submitted for a master suite addition with the condition that a final site plan with all impervious surface information is submitted, the windows utilized will be simulated divided light, siding to be Hardiplank and roofing is to match the existing home. Dr. Price seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

2. **100 E. Carolina Avenue-** Mr. McCord presented his proposal for a new single-family residence at 100 E. Carolina Avenue. Mr. McCord explained that they took inspiration from the district's Carolina "I" Houses. The board members questioned the slab on grade foundation choice as it is not prevalent in the historic district. Ms. Burton brought up the issue of the application of brick to the exterior of the foundation, creating a step out from the body of the house. Mr. Kennedy suggested that the homeowner use thin brick to resolve this. The board members agreed they would want to see this detail demonstrated in the drawings. The board members and Mr. McCord discussed the site itself and that he would also be coming back before the board with a garage design and updated site plan. The board members expressed that they felt the design of the house, in general, was acceptable, but they wanted to see more detail on how the foundation will be designed so to not appear as a house that is slab on grade. The board members ask Mr. McCord to come back to the board with a final submittal and updated foundation detail. This was a conceptual review so no vote was taken.

3. **208 S. Cedar Street-** Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Bowers recused themselves from participating in this review. Mr. Liollio, the architect for the proposed mixed-use development presented the proposal for 208 S. Cedar Street. He walked through their conceptual design and discussed the context for the project and the purpose of the site design. The board members remarked that they appreciated the care and detail given to the proposal. Ms. Burton expressed her concerns about the height and placement of some of the buildings overwhelming some aspects of the site and surrounding areas. Mr. Roberts, the developer of the proposal, asked the board members if their general site layout, massing, and height were acceptable to the board. The board members expressed the desire to see more detail. Mr. Liollio and Mr. Roberts reiterated that they could not move forward with the process of design if the general height, scale, and mass of the project were not supported by the board. Chairman Dixon stated that he believed the board, in general, was in favor of what had been presented. Several board members echoed the sentiment that they thought the conceptual design was very well done and that the applicants were headed in the right direction with their design. This was a conceptual review, so no vote was taken on the overall project. The board members did vote unanimously to allow variance to the 8' landscape buffer requirement in the UDO.

Miscellaneous: N/A

Adjourn: Chairman Dixon adjourned the meeting at 8:33 pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Becca Zimmerman, Planner II
Date: 3/31/22

Approved: _____
Philip G. Dixon PE, CFM, Chairman Or,
Dr. David Price, Vice Chairman