

I. Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Conway Historic District Commission was held on Monday, February 23, 2026, at City Hall.

Members present: Josh Hamilton, Chair, Marilyn Moix, Secretary, Jason Covington, Nathaniel Johnson, Jr., JT Dixon, and Ali Dyer.

Members absent: Corey Parks, Vice Chair.

II. Approval of minutes: December meeting minutes were not available at this time. Motion to Table until next March meeting was entered by Jason Covington and second given by Nathaniel Johnson. Passes 6/0.

III. 713 1st Street Applicant not present.

Tara gave a brief overview that this is for placement of out buildings and this should be tabled due to the fact that the applicant is not present. Josh asked for a motion to table - Jason Covington entered a motion to table - Nathaniel Johnson seconded. Passes 6/0.

IV. 508 Oak Street Becca Alexander

New Signage for the Maverick Service Station (formerly Kum & Go).

The applicant wishes to install a new monument sign on the south-eastern-most side of the acreage as a replacement to the signage already present that was approved by the HDC in March of 2022. The height increase of the new sign is due to Mavericks Nitro pricing. Due to the city's code they are restricted to numbers only and it cannot change often, therefore the reason for all types of fuel to be seen on signage. The overlay district rules state that signage must resemble the business that they serve. Planning staff would support the design as they have at the Old Morrilton Highway location of Maverick.

For - Ronnie Skipper - Hot Springs Sign Company

Mr. Skipper is here to answer any questions that the commission may have about the process of replacing signage. He is seeing the brick structure for the first time tonight. He feels sure that they can do this structure if that is deemed necessary. Mr. Skipper did not have any questions for the commission.

Against - None.

Josh brings this item to the commission: Jason stated that the proposed sign is not that different from the sign that is there now and he believes the proposal to be straightforward. Josh concurs. Tara states that if the commission is going to entertain the proposal that does not have the brick to be approved then condition #2 will need to be removed all together or amended as it speaks to the applicant shall submit to Planning staff an alternative design with characteristics that include a variation in material, color, and/or shape with the understanding that the overall size of the sign may increase to accommodate details that complement the primary structure on site. Josh

asks if there is anything that requires the brick. Tara says no, the brick is an example - the guidelines and requirements refer to the sign complementing the structure. Josh states that in his opinion if there is nothing in the guidelines that require the brick is necessary he is okay with striking condition #2. Jason said if the brick was a requirement it would already be there with the existing signage. Nathaniel asked if the other signs were the same size as the Old Morrilton Highway - Tara said yes. JC states that he doesn't see an issue since you are not removing masonry/brick of any type, you are just matching the style that it already has.

Josh asks for a motion to approve the project while striking condition #2.

Jason makes a motion to approve the project while striking condition #2 - Nathaniel seconds the motion. Passes 6/0.

Mr. Skipper has a question: the sign is currently sitting in a landscape bed, is the City going to require additional landscaping be done or will the existing be sufficient? Tara refers this question to Becca who stated that the existing landscaping is sufficient.

V. 557 Locust Avenue Andrea Holt

Tara gives a brief overview of another sign request. The zoning is O3 - restricted office and is in the Transition District. It sits in the area of converted single family residences that have been made into offices/commercial uses. Some signs in this area appear to be legally non-conforming with respect to the Conway Sign Code as well as the Old Conway regulations, meaning that they were installed prior to the adoption of the current code or the Old Conway code and are non-conforming by one or more of those regulations. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing 2-pole sign, which is legally non-conforming. They have given 2 different options; (option #2) post panel with white metal posts - 5' tall with 40 sq ft; the other option (option #1) is a stacked rock/stone with dbl sided non-lit cabinet. This sign is 5' tall with an area of 40 sq ft per side. The existing sign is slightly larger and either option 1 or 2 proposed will be slightly smaller but comparable in height to the existing sign. The poles on the existing sign are made of wood and rotting - thus the reason the applicant is wanting to replace it. Without HDC approval the applicant cannot exceed 16 sq ft and 4ft in height. Also, the sign should complement the structure that it serves. This structure in question was built in 1927, built in the Craftsman Style. It is for that reason that Planning staff believes that the post construction would complement the structure best.

Conditions

1. Signage shall be permitted and installed in accordance with the Conway Sign Code.
2. The post panel sign with 4" white metal posts with finials on top shall be installed.
3. The entire free-standing sign may not exceed 40 sq ft and 5ft in height.

For: Andrea Holt, Little Rock Sign-Conway Sign, Inc., 740 S. German Lane, Conway

When she originally submitted the two options they were still in the planning stages. They have since created another option. It does have a rock base but not the large columns on the sides. She has copies for the commission of this new design and would like for it to be considered, as it is less obtrusive and considered to be more complementary to the structure. The size of this new option is still the same sq footage. There are several other signs along Locust Street that have a brick base, so she feels like the stone is complementary to the area and the structure. The owner has not decided on which of the three options they like the best at this time so we are here today to ask that you approve either of the options. Josh asks Tara if we are okay to entertain all options and she said yes and they can be approved for an either/or situation. Josh just wanted to make sure that the applicant did not have to return to the HDC.

Against - None.

Josh brings this in for commission discussion. 3 options are available and Josh does not believe that option #1 is complementary to the structure. He does think the #2 metal post one and option #3 (just presented tonight) complement both the structure and the surrounding area, but he is interested in hearing other opinions. Jason thinks option #2 or 3 are most complementary to the structure. Tara clarifies for the audience at home the look of the new option. If the commission is approving option 2 or 3 to be submitted to the Planning staff for approval condition 2 will be amended to read; The post panel sign with 4" white metal posts with finials on top shall be installed (option #2) or a sign with a stacked rock/stone base with capstone without the stacked rock/stone columns may also be permitted.

Josh asks for a motion.

Jason motions for approval of option 2 or 3 - JC seconds the motion. Passes 6/0.

Tara brings attention to the commission that the tabled applicant from earlier this evening has arrived. We will hear his application and strike the need to table it from earlier in this transcript. Josh asks for a motion to hear his application - Jason motions to hear item 1A - Nathaniel seconds. Passes 6/0.

713 1st Street

Juan Valenzuela-Gonzalez

Tara gives an overview - Zoning is R-2A Old Conway/Transition District

In October 2023 the HDC approved an application to rebuild a residential outbuilding to its original dimensions. The old building had been demolished due to disrepair. The C of A for the approved project expired in October 2025 because a building permit had yet to be issued.

The applicant has installed an additional outbuilding on the property without the benefit of permit and is seeking after-the-fact approval for this outbuilding.

We are looking at two different outbuildings for approval; previously approved by HDC is #1 and outbuilding #2 has already been installed on site. This is a residential property adjacent to businesses. It is fluid to regulations as it is in the Transition Zone and it is where residential meets commercial. The outbuildings are shown on the site plan as adhering to the setbacks required in the Transition Zone, however, upon aerial imagery (which is not always perfect) but it appears that the new outbuilding is installed right on the property line; if approved it will need to be moved to be in compliance with regulations; 15ft from the center line of the ally that you can see behind the residence. The height of the outbuilding should not dominate the site - the height of outbuilding #1 is 12ft and the height of outbuilding #2 is 10ft and the primary structure is 16ft. Lot coverage in the Transition Zone for all impervious surfaces should be 80% and it appears both buildings and drives (concrete or pavers) are at 44%. This will need to be confirmed prior to receiving a C of A. The applicant is currently using two gravel/dirt driveways and they will need to be brought into conformity with concrete, permeable pavers or ribbon driveways. Sidewalks will need to be installed prior to any final permit and two canopy trees will need to be planted. Looking at scale in the neighborhood the approximate sf of the buildings would need to be 650 (this math was done with aerial imagery). The total sf of both outbuilding 1 & 2 is 1,140sf. The surrounding area does not have a cohesive style of outbuildings as there are many styles with a mix residential/commercial area. The new structure will be visible from the street and the existing outbuilding is barnlike and is visible from the street. There are no overall guidelines for the Suburban Zone, the sq footage of the two outbuildings is approximately 86%, but if this were in the Suburban Zone the maximum sq footage would be 30%. For the architectural aspect the siding should complement the surrounding area and the applicant is proposing fiber cement siding with a singled roof on outbuilding #1 and outbuilding #2 is constructed of wood with a metal roof.

Conditions

1. Applicant must obtain all applicable building permits if/when a C of A is granted. This includes a building permit for the already installed shed.
2. Two canopy trees shall be planted along 1st Street.
3. Prior to issuance of C of A, the applicant shall provide Planning Staff with an updated site plan showing the total lot coverage for impervious surfaces on site.
4. Prior to building permit final, a 5ft wide sidewalk shall be constructed along 1st Street.
5. The metal roof on outbuilding #2 shall be modified to match the primary structure's roofing materials.

For: Juan Valenzuela-Gonzalez, 713 1st Street, Conway

Everything is the same. I just talked with Tara about changes to a metal material allowing him to take the outbuilding apart if he moves. He also states that it is cheaper for him to build in metal. He does not have that much money to work with but he needs these buildings to protect his equipment. He realizes that it is residential, but the house next door to him has a metal roof and the commercial building on the street is metal also. If this was a primary house he would of course use wood/bricks, etc., but it is storage for his equipment for work and he is asking to use metal so he doesn't have to leave it there if he moves. He placed the small storage building there to protect his equipment while he works on the bigger outbuilding. He felt like he didn't have a choice but to buy the smaller building. Because he is on 2 lots he hopes to put the new outbuilding on ½ of the other lot. He plans to put driveways on both sides of the outbuildings and hopes that will be nice.

Josh asks for questions from the commissioners for the applicant.

Ali asks if it is his intention to have two outbuildings or to replace the blue one with the original outbuilding design approved in 2022? Juan replied; his intention was to use it temporarily but if he could have both it would be very helpful.

Josh has a question for Tara; With all of the measurements taken with aerial imagery was anything out of conformance, was it on the line out of conformance or was it egregiously out of conformance? Could we take the actual measurements and it be in conformance? Tara would say that taking a look at the other three in the neighborhood that these would be about twice the amount of outbuildings in the area.

Marilyn asks if the question from Josh to Tara received the answer he requested; the blue shed being on the property line/distance of 15ft from center of ally? Tara says it appears that the roof line appears on aerial imagery to be on the line.

Juan asks if the blue shed is less than 10ft from the property line? Tara says yes but they have not actually measured it. He thinks it is 12ft due to the fact that he can drive his large mower between it and the fence. Tara points out that the fence is not on the property line. He states that he went by the stakes in the ground when installing the fence. He measured 15ft from the fence when putting the blue shed in. Jason asked about the placement of the fence in the photo. Tara asks her co-workers if the verification of the shed placement could happen when doing footing inspection after getting the building permit? They stated, yes. Surveys can certainly help when determining property lines - she is not certain if that was done.

Josh asks if we (HDC) need to be concerned with the placement of the blue shed? Tara says no, that will be determined upon inspection. The HDC just needs to be concerned with one vs. two outbuildings and Juan would like to have considered that the outbuilding that has not been constructed yet to be completely out of metal rather than a hardy or a wood.

Against - None.

Josh brings discussion to the commission. Is everyone clear on the requests of the applicant? We have two outbuildings being proposed, one already in place and one to be built. Together they would exceed the sq ft allotted. Tara says not necessarily due to the fact that it is the Transition Zone. This is a really discretionary space within Conway of the HDC.

Jason asked if when the approval was given previously for this new build it was #1 option. Tara answered, yes. He would lean more toward approving the original ask/approval than to allow a metal building.

Tara states that in the Transition Zone there are not specifics about building materials. In the Urban Zone they do not allow sheet metal siding but do allow Architectural metal siding. Josh is leaning toward that same thought process as Jason in leaving the building materials as was already approved.

JC asks Tara if the Transition Zone is not as strict on the metal siding as it would be in other areas of Old Conway. Tara says no; the materials are called out for Suburban as sheet metal sheathing is prohibited. In the Urban area they can have only Architectural metal siding. We do see a lot of legally non-conforming metal structures in this Zone.

Josh asks the commission if they see any issues with considering a metal building option?

Marilyn said she goes back to what the applicant said about "if he was building a residence and was being seen fully from the street he would use wood/bricks". He is trying to make a living and we support that in Conway and she would not have a problem with the new build being out of metal. Tara states for clarity that fiber/concrete was the original material approved for this new build and the applicant is asking to change to metal.

Josh asks for motion. Jason motions to approve outbuilding #1 as it was originally approved. Ali seconded.

Tara asks before the vote are we doing two separate motions or considering both buildings in one? Josh asks the commission if they are approving both buildings? JT asks if the blue shed is approved and needs to be moved with it come back before the commission again? Tara states; No.

Josh asks for motion again. Jason motions to approve the outbuilding previously approved with the same materials and keeping the existing shed structure in place. Ali seconds. Passes 6/0.

Tara instructs the applicant that she will need the impervious surface sq footage; driveways and sidewalks, etc., in order to give the C of A and he can continue on with the building permit process.

Additional items: Tara shared that last year the district regulations were amended to have more administrative reviews and she wanted to point out in the appendix that the administrative review of three outbuildings were approved by staff as they were 100% compliant with district standards.

Josh calls to adjourn. Jason makes a motion to adjourn. Nathaniel seconds. Passes 6/0.

/mm