TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND
Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting
May 4, 2018 – 2:30 PM

Town Hall, Council Chambers
2001 Seabrook Island Road

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting: November 30, 2016 [Pages 2–4]

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. **Variance Application # 155** [Pages 5–106]

   **APPLICANT:** Eric L. Ison and Melanie A. Bootes
   **LOCATION:** 2666 Persimmon Pond Court
   **TAX MAP NUMBER:** 147-01-00-069 (LT 38, BLK 5)
   **ZONING DISTRICT:** SR Single-Family Residential
   **VARIANCE(S) REQUESTED:** To reduce the front yard setback from 30 feet to 18 feet (§ 7.60.20.10); to reduce the side yard setback from 10 feet to 7 feet (§ 7.60.20.41); and to reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet (15 feet for open decks) to 13 feet (2 feet for open decks and pervious driveway) (§ 7.60.50).

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

*There are no Items for Information / Discussion*

ADJOURN
Present: Joe Sanders (Chairman), Jerry Farber (Vice Chairman), Robert Quagliato, David Osborn, Walter Sewell, Randy Pierce (Zoning Administrator), Lynda Whitworth (Secretary)

Absent: None

Guests: Michael Karamus (Architect), Mr. and Mrs. Greg Iaconis

Chairman Joe Sanders called the meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals to order at 2:30 p.m. The requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were fulfilled and the hearing was properly posted.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. Variance Application #154: 2726 Old Oak Walk: The property owners, Mr. and Mrs. Greg Iaconis, were represented by Architect Michael Karamus. The property owners were seeking relief from Development Standard Ordinance (DSO) Section 7.60.20.30 Minimum Setbacks; Rear Setback, twenty five (25) feet. The property is located at 2726 Old Oak Walk. The lot is 10,096 square feet and is non-conforming according to the DSO.

The testimony of Michael Karamus was sworn. The opening statements made by Mr. Karamus informed the Board that Mr. and Mrs. Iaconis had recently purchased their home. The home was originally built 1982 prior to the incorporation of the Town of Seabrook Island. According to his testimony, Mr. Karamus explained that the owners’ intent after purchase was to add a study in the existing attic. After the cost of renovating the attic exceeded the anticipated budget, another plan was discussed.

The new design was proposed to use the perimeter of the existing open decks and the original foundation. An enclosed study was proposed at the location of the open deck adjacent to the master bedroom. A covered porch was proposed for the open deck off of the great room.

Mr. Karamus explained that after an as-built survey was drawn, it became apparent the existing structure, which is located on a non-conforming lot, is well over the required 25’
rear yard setback. The proposed new construction would use the existing foundation of the building and no further encroachment would be required.

The variance request would allow for limited encroachment into the rear setback. The rear yard abuts a pond. The house was constructed in 1983. Mr. Karamus proposed that the existing decks were grandfathered because the date of construction was prior to the 1987 incorporation of the town. The setbacks at that time were 10 feet from the property line. Plan review prior to the incorporation of the town was performed by the Charleston County Planning Department.

Randy Pierce, the town’s Zoning Administrator, advised the board that an open deck can encroach into the rear setback by up to 10 feet. Mr. Pierce added that the open decks attached to the home already encroach into the rear setback. He explained that construction of a roof over the open deck changes the classification of the deck to that of a structure. Structures, including an enclosed room or a covered porch, are limited to a 25 foot setback, and the home already encroaches into the rear setback.

Jerry Farber referred to the Town’s zoning ordinances as to when the Board of Zoning Appeals may grant or deny a variance. He reviewed the conditions and, afterward, gave his point of view on granting the variance.

Extraordinary conditions
Are there exceptional conditions that pertain to the property such as size shape or topography? Mr. Farber does not feel the condition applies to the property.

Conditions
Do the conditions generally apply to other property? Robert Quagliato replied the conditions would apply to all properties because the same process is followed when applying for a variance. Mr. Farber agreed.

Utilization
Because of the conditions, does the application of the ordinance to the particular pieces of property unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property? Mr. Farber stated the ordinance does limit the use of the property.

Detriment
Will authorization of the variance cause detriment to adjacent properties. Mr. Farber feels that it would be a detriment to other properties.

Mr. Farber continued by explaining the Board of Zoning Appeals can not grant a variance that will allow the establishment of use not otherwise permitted, or physically extend a nonconforming use of land. Mr. Farber felt that to grant the variance would be violation of the ordinance by allowing further encroachment into the setback.
Chairman Sanders advised the Board there was no other testimony to hear. He asked the Board to vote to approve or deny the variance request. He advised those attending the meeting that a “yes” vote is to approve the variance, and a “no” vote is to deny the request.

The vote was recorded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Osborn</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Quagliato</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Sewell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman Gerald Farber</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Joe Sanders</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chairman Sanders announced that based on the majority of votes, the Variance request was denied.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **Previous Meeting:** Draft minutes from the previous meeting were distributed to board members prior in advance of the meeting. Chairman Sanders asked for a motion to approve the draft minutes as submitted. Robert Quagliato moved to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Walter Sewell. The motion to approve was unanimous.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

1. **Comments from Chairman Sanders:** Chairman Sanders advised the Board that he would no longer be serving on the Board of Appeals. He has notified Mayor Ron Ciancio of his intent to leave the Board. The Mayor has accepted the resignation as Chairman and member of the Board of Zoning Appeals. The members of the Board thanked the Chairman for his service to the Town.

There being no further business, Chairman Sanders asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Quagliato made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Sewell seconded the motion. The motion to adjourn passed unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes Approved: Joseph M. Cronin
Town Administrator
MEMORANDUM

TO: Town of Seabrook Island Board of Zoning Appeals Members
FROM: Joseph M. Cronin, Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator
SUBJECT: Variance Application # 155 – 2666 Persimmon Pond Court (Lot 38, Block 5)
MEETING DATE: May 4, 2018

Variance Application #155

| Applicants: | Eric L. Ison and Melanie A. Bootes (Owners)  
|            | Tyler Smyth (Agent)  
|            | Stuart Rumph (Agent) |
| Location:  | 2666 Persimmon Pond Court |
| Tax Map Number: | 147-01-00-069 (Lot 38, Block 5) |
| Zoning District: | SR Single-Family Residential |
| Variance(s) Requested: | To reduce the front yard setback from 30 feet to 18 feet (§ 7.60.20.10); to reduce the side yard setback from 10 feet to 7 feet (§ 7.60.20.41); and to reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet (15 feet for open decks) to 13 feet (2 feet for open decks and pervious driveway) (§ 7.60.50). |

Overview

The Town has received a variance request from Eric L. Ison and Melanie A. Bootes, the owners of Charleston County Tax Map # 147-01-00-069. The applicants are requesting a reduction in the front, side and marsh setback requirements to accommodate construction of a new single-family residence at 2666 Persimmon Pond Court (Lot 38, Block 5). The proposed residence will contain approximately 3,600 square feet of vertical improvements.

Per the enclosed survey, the total area of the lot is approximately 16,814.7 square feet. A significant portion of the property (4,481.6 square feet, or 26.7% of the total lot) is covered by marsh area, lying beyond the SCDHEC-OCRM critical line. Prior to applying the required setbacks, the lot contains approximately 12,333.1 square feet of high ground.

For lots recorded prior to 2007, the town’s Development Standards Ordinance (DSO) requires a minimum of 17,500 square feet for a lot to be considered as “conforming.” The subject property was recorded in 1978 and, therefore, would be considered a “non-conforming lot of record.” § 3.40.10 of the DSO states:

“In any zoning district, where a lot of record at the effective date of adoption of this Ordinance does not contain sufficient land area or dimensions to meet the requirements...
of the district in which it is located, such lot may be used as a building site for any use that
is a permitted use in the zoning district in which the lot is located provided that all
structures on these lots must conform to the minimum front and side yard requirements
set forth in this Ordinance for the district in which the lot is located.”

The property is currently zoned SR Single-Family Residential, and a single-family residence is a
permitted use by-right. The town’s DSO requires the following setbacks within the SR District:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED PER DSO</th>
<th>DSO REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front (Principal Structure)</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>§ 7.60.20.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (Uncovered Steps)</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>§ 7.60.80.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (Non-conforming Lot)</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>§ 7.60.20.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh (Principal Structure)</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>§ 7.60.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh (Open Deck)</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>§ 7.60.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway (Non-conforming Lot)</td>
<td>3 feet</td>
<td>§ 7.60.70.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Encroachment for Eaves &amp; Overhangs (Lots &lt; 17,500 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>18 inches</td>
<td>§ 7.60.80.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the required setbacks are applied to the remaining high ground, the total buildable area of the
lot will contain less than 2,400 square feet. Of this area, approximately 1,000 square feet will have a
dimensional width of 20 feet or more, due to the irregular shape of the lot. Therefore, the
applicants are requesting a variance from the DSO to allow for the following setback reductions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED PER DSO</th>
<th>2018 VARIANCE (REQUESTED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front (Principal Structure)</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>18 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (Uncovered Steps)</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (Non-conforming Lot)</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>7 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh (Principal Structure)</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>13 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh (Open Deck)</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>2 feet (Including pervious deck and guest parking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway (Non-conforming Lot)</td>
<td>3 feet</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Encroachment for Eaves &amp; Overhangs (Lots &lt; 17,500 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>18 inches</td>
<td>0 inches (No encroachment beyond reduced setbacks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their application, the applicants have stated that there are “extraordinary and exceptional
conditions pertaining to this particular piece of property” as a result of its non-conforming size,
irregular shape, narrow dimensions and the presence of protected marshland. The applicants
further add that without the requested setback reductions, it would be “unfeasible to build a home
of conventional design on the property.”

**Background**

The property was subject to a variance request in early 1993. At the time of the application, the
property was under contract for sale from Heinz F. and Isis N. Hutter to Andrea M. Bonette. Ms.
Bonette, as the prospective buyer, served as the applicant.

In order to construct a single-family residence of approximately 2,780 square feet, Ms. Bonette requested a variance from the following requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED PER DSO (1993)</th>
<th>1993 VARIANCE (APPROVED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front (Principal Structure)</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>18 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (Uncovered Steps)</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side 1</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>7 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh (Principal Structure)</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>13 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh (Open Deck)</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>2 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway 2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Encroachment for Eaves &amp; Overhangs 3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 It does not appear that the DSO allowed reduced side yard setbacks for non-conforming lots in 1993. Therefore, a minimum side yard setback of 15 feet would have applied. An amendment adopted on July 28, 1998 (Ord. 1998-18) allowed setbacks on non-conforming lots to be reduced from 15 feet to 10 feet or 12.5 feet, depending on the lot size.

2 A driveway variance was not addressed in the original request, nor was one shown on the proposed site plan. The driveway setback requirement from 1993 is currently unknown. A text amendment to the DSO for driveways was adopted on September 14, 1995 (Ord. 1995-13). The current setback requirement (3 feet for non-conforming lots) was adopted on July 25, 2000 (Ord. 2000-09).

3 It does not appear that the DSO allowed eaves and overhangs to encroach into the required setbacks on non-conforming lots in 1993. This amendment was adopted on January 27, 2004 (Ord. 2003-11).

In granting the variance request on February 5, 1993, the Board of Zoning Appeals made the following conclusions:

“This is a non-conforming lot and it is virtually impossible to build while conforming to all setback ordinances. Without variances the lot is of virtually no value. Thus a serious hardship exists. After much discussion and after examining other possible approaches to the problem, it was concluded that the buyers request was as reasonable as any other.”

The motion approving the variance request was as follows:

 “[Board member] Wayne Hockersmith offered the following motion: It was moved that the variances requested by the buyer be granted with the proviso that complete plans to control rain water run-off be included with the house plans for approval by the Zoning Administrator. The motion was seconded by [Board member] Joe Bickle and unanimously approved.”
Despite the Board’s approval of a variance in 1993, there is no record of the original applicant – or any subsequent owner – obtaining a building permit to construct a residence, or any other improvement, over the last 25 years. As of 2018, the property remains vacant.

Since the original variance was approved in February 1993, the property has been transferred a total of three times:

- **February 17, 1993**: From Heinz F. & Isis N. Hutter to Andrea M. Bonette ($107,000)
- **April 6, 2006**: From Andrea M. Bonette to Ralph B. & Nancy O. Finno ($465,000)
- **June 24, 2016**: From Ralph B. & Nancy O. Finno to Eric L. Ison & Melanie A. Bootes ($340,000)

Town staff was notified earlier this year that the current property owners, Eric L. Ison and Melanie A. Bootes, were seeking to construct a single-family residence on the property. A proposed site plan was prepared based on the reduced setbacks approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals in 1993.

The applicants have stated in their application that they consulted with the town’s former Zoning Administrator, Randy Pierce, prior to purchasing the property in 2016, and were informed by him that the 1993 variance was still valid. The town’s current zoning Administrator, Joseph Cronin, spoke to Mr. Pierce by telephone earlier this year. While Mr. Pierce stated that while he didn't remember this conversation specifically, it was his belief that a variance approved in 1993 would still be valid.

Shortly after receiving notification of the applicant’s intent to build, the current Zoning Administrator consulted with the Town Attorney and several other planning and zoning officials across the state to determine if a 25-year old variance, which was approved but never acted upon, was still valid. As a result of these discussions, the Zoning Administrator determined that the variance had expired as a result of the following:

- The state’s Vested Rights Act, adopted in 2004, established a “vested right” to develop an approved “site-specific development plan” for two years following approval, with the ability to receive up to five annual extensions (upon application) “unless an amendment to the land development ordinances or regulations has been adopted that prohibits approval.” (S.C. Code of Laws, Sec. 6-29-1510 through -1560). Further, § 13.90.10(1)(b) of the town’s DSO states that a “Site specific development plan in addition . . . to the definition set forth in [the South Carolina Code of Laws] is further defined to mean those documents that comprise a complete application for a … variance…” Accordingly, if the variance was presumed to be valid at the time the Vested Rights Act was adopted, it was staff's opinion that any right to develop under the 1993 site plan would have been extinguished within two years following adoption of the Act.

- The original site plan from 1993 was based upon a critical line that was delineated by the Carolina Coastal Council (precursor to SCDHEC-OCRM) more than 25 years ago. The marsh location has changed substantially over the last 25 years. Critical lines marked by SCDHEC-OCRM are typically valid for a period of 5 years. Because of changes to the
critical line, the original site plan – the plan upon which the original variance was granted in 1993 – would not be buildable today, as a portion of the house would now be located inside the marsh area.

Notwithstanding the items listed above, the proposed site plan contains a substantially different layout than the plan that was included with the variance request in 1993. This raised a subsequent legal question as to whether a variance authorizing a setback reduction should be applied only to a site-specific development plan (ie. the 1993 plan) or whether it was in fact a blanket reduction of the setback requirement and, therefore, would extend along the length of all property lines. While it is our opinion that a variance would be tied to a site-specific development plan, to date, we have not identified any case law in South Carolina where this question has been definitively settled.

While the applicant’s have reserved their right to challenge the town’s assertion that the 1993 variance is no longer valid, they have agreed to move forward with a request for a new variance.

As illustrated in the chart below, the new variance request is nearly identical to the variance approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals in 1993; however, the reduced setbacks would be applied to the site as it exists today (including the updated critical line). Aside from modifications to the building layout, the only requested change is that the setback reduction approved by the Board for “open decks” in 1993 similarly apply to a pervious guest parking area. (The remainder of the driveway will meet the current 3-foot setback requirement.) In addition, while the DSO would otherwise allow eaves and overhangs to encroach up to 18 inches into a required setback, if approved, no portion of the structure – including eaves and overhangs – are proposed to encroach into the reduced setback areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED PER DSO (2018)</th>
<th>1993 VARIANCE (APPROVED)</th>
<th>2018 VARIANCE (REQUESTED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front (Principal Structure)</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>18 feet</td>
<td>18 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (Uncovered Steps)</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (Non-conforming Lot)</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>7 feet</td>
<td>7 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh (Principal Structure)</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>13 feet</td>
<td>13 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh (Open Deck)</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>2 feet (Deck only)</td>
<td>2 feet (Including pervious deck and guest parking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway (Non-conforming Lot)</td>
<td>3 feet</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Encroachment for Eaves &amp; Overhangs (Lots &lt; 17,500 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>18 inches</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0 inches (No encroachment beyond reduced setback lines)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Comments**

As a matter of practice, the town’s Zoning Administrator does not typically provide a recommendation in favor of – or in opposition to – a variance application. In our opinion, these requests are best left to the Board of Zoning Appeals following a thorough review of the relevant facts, including the receipt of testimony from interested parties during the required public hearing. However, we do feel it is appropriate to provide some commentary on this request.
First, we would place a great deal of emphasis on the fact that, in granting a variance for the property in 1993, a previous Board made a determination that: 1) there were extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to this property; 2) that these conditions did not generally apply to other property; 3) that a strict application of the setback requirements would prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property; and 4) that the setback reductions would not be of substantial detriment to neighboring properties. In short, the Board determined that the setback reductions were both reasonable and necessary to allow the owners to use their property.

Second, it is our opinion that the property is even more restricted today than it was in 1993, due primarily to changes in the SCDHEC-OCRM critical line over the last 25 years. With the exception of a larger building footprint and the addition of guest parking (perVIOUS), the requested setback reductions are substantially the same as those approved by the Board in 1993.

While the decision to grant or deny a variance is solely within the purview of the Board of Zoning Appeals, given all of the facts and circumstances surrounding the history of this property, and for the reasons mentioned above, town staff would support the granting of a variance.

In granting a variance, state law permits the Board of Zoning Appeals to attach such conditions as the Board may consider advisable to protect established property values in the surrounding area or to promote the public health, safety, or general welfare. Should the Board vote to approve the variance request, staff would recommend in favor of attaching the following conditions:

- The approved variance shall apply to the building layout as shown on the site-specific plan prepared by Tyler A. Smyth Architects, dated March 15, 2018. Any modification to this site-specific plan prior to the issuance of a zoning permit, with the exception of minor corrections and/or modifications which conform to the requirements of the town’s DSO, shall require subsequent review and approval by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

- The survey for the property includes a critical line delineation which was certified by SCDHEC-OCRM on January 29, 2015. The signature line on the survey states, in part: “The critical line shown on this plat is valid for five years from the date of this signature.” Staff would recommend including a condition that the variance shall expire on January 29, 2020 (5 years from the date of OCRM certification) if no building permit has been issued by that date.

- Prior to issuance of a zoning permit, the applicant shall submit detailed plans to control stormwater run-off, consistent with Town of Seabrook Island and Charleston County stormwater requirements, to the Zoning Administrator for review and approval.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph M. Cronin
Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator
Criteria for Review

Pursuant to Section 6-29-800(A)(2) of the SC Code of Laws, the Board of Zoning Appeals has the power to hear and decide appeals for variance from the requirements of the zoning ordinance when strict application of the provisions of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship. A variance may be granted in an individual case of unnecessary hardship if the board makes and explains in writing the following findings:

(a) there are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property;

(b) these conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity;

(c) because of these conditions, the application of the ordinance to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property; and

(d) the authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.

The board may not grant a variance, the effect of which would be to allow the establishment of a use not otherwise permitted in a zoning district, to extend physically a nonconforming use of land or to change the zoning district boundaries shown on the official zoning map. The fact that property may be utilized more profitably, if a variance is granted, may not be considered grounds for a variance. Other requirements may be prescribed by the zoning ordinance.

In granting a variance, the board may attach to it such conditions regarding the location, character, or other features of the proposed building, structure, or use as the board may consider advisable to protect established property values in the surrounding area or to promote the public health, safety, or general welfare.
The following supplemental items have been attached for review:

### 2018 Variance Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Variance Application</td>
<td>13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proposed Site Plan</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Property Survey</td>
<td>20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Property Photos</td>
<td>22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zoning Map &amp; Aerial Image</td>
<td>31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FEMA Base Flood Elevations (Current &amp; Preliminary)</td>
<td>33-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Title to Real Estate</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Hearing Notice – List of Neighboring Property Owners</td>
<td>41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Public Hearing Notice – U.S.P.S. Certified Mail Receipts</td>
<td>43-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Public Hearing Notice – Post and Courier Legal Ad</td>
<td>46-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Public Hearing Notice – Property Posting</td>
<td>48-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Letter from Eric L. Ison (March 1, 2018)</td>
<td>50-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Letter from Eric L. Ison (March 9, 2018)</td>
<td>56-58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1993 Variance Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Variance Application (1993)</td>
<td>59-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Proposed Site Plan (1993)</td>
<td>62-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>BOZA Variance Approval Letter (1993)</td>
<td>64-65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Subdivision Plat for Persimmon Pond Court (1978)</td>
<td>70-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Neighboring Property Information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) 2637 Persimmon Pond Court (Lot 35, Block 5)</td>
<td>72-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) 2647 Persimmon Pond Court (Lot 36, Block 5)</td>
<td>76-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) 2656 Persimmon Pond Court (Lot 39, Block 5) <em>Note: This property has a non-conforming front and marsh setback (Variance approved by BOZA in 1989)</em></td>
<td>80-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) 2646 Persimmon Pond Court (Lot 40, Block 5)</td>
<td>85-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) 2636 Persimmon Pond Court (Lot 41/42, Block 5) <em>Note: This property has a non-conforming marsh setback (Constructed in 1986, prior to incorporation)</em></td>
<td>89-92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Written Correspondence Regarding the Proposed Variance Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Letter from Patricia Linton (April 9, 2018)</td>
<td>93-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Letter from James &amp; Kathleen Hatley (April 19, 2018)</td>
<td>97-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Letter from Tina &amp; Larry Mayland (April 20, 2018)</td>
<td>100-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Letter from Larry &amp; Marilyn Margolis (April 23, 2018)</td>
<td>102-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Letter from Susan Rock (April 25, 2018)</td>
<td>105-106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variance Application
NOTICE OF APPEAL – Form 1
Board of Zoning Appeals
TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND-COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

Date Filed: 3/20/18  (To be Completed by Office Administration)
Application Fee: $350.00
Permit Application#: 155 Appeal#

This form must be completed for a hearing on an Appeal (1) from the action of a zoning official, (2) application for a Variance or (3) application for Special Exception. Applications should be printed or typewritten. If the application is on behalf of the property owner(s), all owners must sign. If the applicant is not an owner, the owner(s) all must sign the Designation of Agent.

THE APPLICANT HEREBY APPEALS [indicate one with an X]:

[ ] From action of a zoning official as stated on attached Form 2.
[ ] For a variance as stated on attached Form 3.
[ ] For a Special Exception as stated on attached Form 4.

2) STUART RUMPH
SEABROOK IS. R.B.
1002 LANDFALL WAY
SEABROOK IS, SC 29455

Applicant(s) [Please print]:
Address: TYLER A. SMYTH, ARCHITECT
990-B MORRISON DR. CHARLESTON SC 29403
Telephone: (843) 724-7787

Owners(s) [if other than Applicant]
Address: 11914 CREEK LODGE DR. LOUISVILLE, KY 40223
Telephone: (502) 587-3564 (502) 599-1983

Property Address: 2664 PERSIMMON POND RD
Lot 38 Block 5 Tax Map #147-01-00-069

Designation of Agent  [Complete only if owner is not applicant]
I (we) hereby appoint the person named as Applicant as my (our) agent to represent me (us) in this application.
Date: 3/19/15

Owner Signature(s)

Applicant’s Certification
I (we) certify that the information in this application and attached Form 2,3 or 4 is correct.
Date: 3/14/18

Applicant Signature(s)
VARIANCE APPLICATION – Form 3
Board of Zoning Appeals
TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND-COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

Date Filed: 3/21/18  (To be Completed by Office Administration)
Permit Application#: ______________
Appeal# ______________

1. Applicant hereby appeals to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance from the strict application to the property described in the Notice of Appeal [Form 1] of the following provision of the Zoning Ordinance: front, side, and rear setbacks 
so that a zoning permit may be issued to allow use of the property in a manner shown on the attached plot plan, described as follows: a single family residence of approx. 3,600SF of conditioned space.

for which a permit has been denied by a zoning official on the grounds that the proposal would be in violation of the cited section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance.

2. The application of the ordinance will result in unnecessary hardship, and the standards for a variance set by State law and the ordinance are met by the following facts:
   a. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property as follows:
      The property is smaller and more irregular in shape than typical lots in the area; see attached letter.
   b. These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity as shown by:
      This non-conforming lot has an irregular shape and small size, having been affected by substantial erosion since its platting in 1978; see attached letter.
   c. Because of these conditions, the application of the ordinance to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property as follows:
      See attached letter
   d. The authorization of the variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance for the following reasons:
      See attached letter

3. The following documents are submitted in support of this application:
   Attached letter of intent; 1993 Variance granted; site plan

   **(An accurate, legible plot plan showing property dimensions and location of all structures and improvements must be attached to a variance application)**

   [Signature of Applicant]  3/15/18
   Date
15 March 2018

Mr. Joseph M. Cronin
Town Administrator
Town of Seabrook Island
2001 Seabrook Island Rd
Seabrook Island, SC 29455

RE: Board of Adjustment Variance Request for Setbacks at 2666 Persimmon Pond Rd;
Owned by Eric Ison and Melanie Bootes, husband and wife currently residing in Louisville, KY.

Dear Mr. Cronin;

We are proposing the a new residence of approximately 3,600 sf on the non-conforming property located at 2666 Persimmon Pond Rd, Seabrook Island. Pursuant to this, we are requesting setback variances as follows:

Side yard: 7 ft each side for house structure, including roof overhangs;

Front: 18 ft to house structure, including roof overhangs; 15 ft to deck/porch/uncovered stair;

Rear/Marsh: 2 ft from OCRM line to pervious deck, pervious patio, or pervious driveway/ parking area; 13 ft to house structure, including roof overhangs;

We believe that providing some background information is pertinent to this matter. There was a granting of the setback variances as requested above in 1993. It was the belief of the current owners that these variances remained applicable and were transferrable when they purchased the property in 2016. Good faith efforts to confirm the validity of the 1993 variances were made in April-June of 2016, with due diligence investigations and discussions with the Town Administrator at the time, Randy Pierce. Upon reviewing the 1993 variance and a conceptual site plan produced by Tyler A. Smyth, Architect, Mr. Pierce confirmed with me in two conversations on May 26, 2016 that the variance would be considered valid and still in effect, in the opinion of the Town. Seabrook RE Executive Stuart Rumph also had direct conversations with Mr. Pierce during this period, in which the Town's opinion on the validity of the variance was confirmed.
We believe that there are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to this particular piece of property. This is a non-conforming lot of highly irregular shape. The latest survey, dated May 6, 2016, measures the property to have 12,305.8 sf of Highland Area. This is smaller than typical lots in the area, and of a more irregular shape than typical lots in the area. The irregular shape, with narrow dimensions generally in the N-S direction, along with the required setbacks, makes it unfeasible to build a home of conventional design on the property.

These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity because they are generally larger and more regular in shape. As this is considered a non-conforming lot under the Town of Seabrook Island zoning ordinance, typical conditions do not generally apply by definition.

We believe that because of these conditions, the application of the ordinance pertaining to required setbacks would effectively prohibit the utilization of the property for the construction of a conventional single family residence. The 1993 variance ruling found that “This is a non-conforming lot and it is virtually impossible to build while conforming to all setback ordinances. Without variances the lot is of virtually no value. Thus a serious hardship exists.” We believe that with additional shoreline erosion and shifting of the OCRM line since 1993, the hardship can only be greater.

The gross buildable footprint given the applicable setbacks is approximately 2,373 sf (19.3% of the 12,305.8 sf Highland Area) and curvilinear in shape. Of this area, only an estimated 1004 sf has a dimensional width of 20’ or more.

We believe that the granting of the variance will not be a detriment to the adjacent properties or to the public good. The residence that we have proposed is an appropriate utilization of this property, fitting within the natural setting and contributing positively to the character of Seabrook Island.

Please let me know if you have any further questions about this application.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tyler A. Smyth, AIA, Principal
Tyler A. Smyth, Architect, LLC
ATTACHMENT #2

Proposed Site Plan
ATTACHMENT #3

Property Survey
ATTACHMENT #4

Property Photos
ATTACHMENT #5

Zoning Map & Aerial Image
ATTACHMENT #6

FEMA Base Flood Elevations
(Current & Preliminary)
Current FEMA Base Flood Elevation (AE-13)

Preliminary FEMA Base Flood Elevation (AE-8)
Title to Real Estate
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that We, Ralph B. Finno and Nancy O. Finno, in the State aforesaid, for and in consideration of the sum of Three Hundred Forty Thousand and 00/100 DOLLARS ($340,000.00), to us in hand paid at and before the sealing of these Presents by Eric L. Ison and Melanie A. Bootes, in the State aforesaid, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, have granted, bargained, sold and released, and by these Presents do grant, bargain, sell and release unto the said Eric L. Ison and Melanie A. Bootes as joint tenants with rights of survivorship and not as tenants in common, the following described property, to-wit:

SEE EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED HERETO
AND INCORPORATED HEREIN BY REFERENCE FOR LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

TMS Number: 147-01-00-069

Address of Grantee(s):

11914 Creel Lodge Drive
Louisville, KY 40223

This is the same property conveyed to the Grantor(s) by deed of conveyance from Andrea M. Bonette, recorded on April 11, 2006, in Book K579, page 748, in the RMC Office for Charleston County, South Carolina.

TOGETHER with all and singular, the rights, members, hereditaments and appurtenances to the said premises belonging or in anywise incident or appertaining.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD, all and singular, the said Premises before mentioned unto the said Eric L. Ison and Melanie A. Bootes as joint tenants with rights of survivorship and not as tenants in common, their heirs and assigns, forever.

AND subject to the exceptions set forth above, we do bind ourselves and our heirs, executors, and administrators, to warrant and forever defend, all and singular, the premises before mentioned unto the said Eric L. Ison and Melanie A. Bootes, their heirs and assigns, against us and our heirs, and all persons whomsoever lawfully claiming, or to claim the same or any part thereof.
WITNESS our Hands and Seals this 16th day of June, in the year of our Lord Two Thousand Sixteen and in the Two Hundred and Fortieth year of the Sovereignty and Independence of the United States of America.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED
IN THE PRESENCE OF:

Witness #1

Witness #2

Ralph B. Finno

Nancy O. Finno

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me by Ralph B. Finno and Nancy O. Finno, this 16th day of June, 2016.

Notary Public for South Carolina
My commission expires:__________

KIRSTIN M. BRADSHAW
Notary Public, South Carolina
My Commission Expires
August 19, 2024
EXHIBIT A

ALL that certain lot, piece, parcel of land, situate, lying and being on Seabrook Island, Charleston County, State of South Carolina, and known and designated as LOT 38, BLOCK 5, on a plat by E.M. Seabrook, Jr., CE & LS, dated October 26, 1977, and recorded in Plat Book AJ, at Page 144, in the Charleston County RMC Office.

Said lot having the size, shape, dimensions, buttings and boundings more or less as are shown on said plat, which is specifically incorporated herein by reference.

THIS CONVEYANCE IS SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

(a) Covenants, conditions, restrictions, reservations, easements, liens for assessments, options, powers of attorney and limitations on title recorded in Book N100, page 296; and as amended in Book Y110, page 143; and as further amended in Book J144, page 067; and as further amended in Book J164, page 487; and as further amended in Book L186, page 697; and as further amended in Book K215, page 023; and as further amended in Book S513, page 341; and as further amended in Book C517, page 808; and as further amended in Book V635, page 522; and as further amended in Book V639, page 557; and as further amended from time to time.

(b) Covenants, conditions, restrictions, reservations, easements, liens for assessments, options, powers of attorney and limitations on title recorded in Book J100, page 107; and as amended in Book S109, page 002; and as further amended in Book B110, page 331; and as further amended in Book H127, page 163; and as further amended in Book B141, page 267; and as further amended in Book J144, page 059; and as further amended in Book L186, page 718; and as further amended in Book K215, page 001; and as further amended from time to time.
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON  

AFFIDAVIT FOR TAXABLE OR EXEMPT TRANSFERS

PERSONALLY appeared before me the undersigned, who being duly sworn, deposes and says:
1. I have read the information on this Affidavit and I understand such information.

2. The property is being transferred is located at 2666 Persimmon Pond Road, Seabrook Island bearing Charleston, County Tax Map Number 147-01-00-069, was transferred by Ralph B. Finno and Nancy O. Finno to Eric L. Ison and Melanie A. Bootes on June 24, 2016.

3. Check one of the following: The deed is
   
   (a) X subject to the deed recording fee as a transfer for consideration paid or to be paid in money or money's worth.
   (b) ___ subject to the deed recording fee as a transfer between a corporation, a partnership, or other entity and a stockholder, partner, or owner of the entity, or is a transfer to a trust or as distribution to a trust beneficiary.
   (c) ___ exempt from the deed recording fee because (See Information section of affidavit): ___________________________ (If exempt, please skip items 4-7, and go to item 8 of this affidavit.)

   If exempt under exemption #14 as described in the Information section of this affidavit, did the agent and principal relationship exist at the time of the original sale and was the purpose of this relationship to purchase the realty? Check Yes _____ or No _____

4. Check one of the following if either item 3(a) or item 3(b) above has been checked (See information section of this affidavit):
   
   (a) X The fee is computed on the consideration paid or to be paid in money or money's worth in the amount of $340,000.00
   (b) ___ The fee is computed on the fair market value of the realty which is $______________
   (c) ___ The fee is computed on the fair market value of the realty as established for property tax purposes which is $ __________

5. Check YES ___ or NO X ___ to the following: A lien or encumbrance existed on the land, tenement, or realty before the transfer and remained on the land, tenement, or realty after the transfer. (This includes, pursuant to Code Section 12-59-140(E)(6), any lien or encumbrance on realty in possession of a forfeited land commission which may subsequently be waived or reduced after the transfer under a signed contract or agreement between the lien holder and the buyer existing before the transfer.) If “Yes,” the amount of the outstanding balance of this lien or encumbrance is: ________________________

6. The deed recording fee is computed as follows:
   (a) Place the amount listed in item 4 above here: 340,000.00
   (b) Place the amount listed in item 5 above here: ________________
   (If no amount is listed, place zero here.)
   (c) Subtract line 6(b) from Line 6(a) and place result here: 340,000.00

7. The deed recording fee due is based on the amount listed on Line 6(c) above and the deed recording fee due is: $1258.00

8. As required by Code Section 12-24-70, I state that I am a responsible person who was connected with the transaction as: Legal Representative

9. I understand that a person required to furnish this affidavit who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent affidavit is guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, must be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

______________________________
Print Name

______________________________
Notary Public for South Carolina
My Commission Expires: ____________

______________________________
Notary Public, South Carolina
My Commission Expires: August 19, 2014
RECORDED

Date: June 27, 2016
Time: 1:17:29 PM

Book 0563  Page 883  DocType Deed

Charlie Lybrand, Register
Charleston County, SC

# of Pages: 5
Recording Fee $10.00
State Fee $884.00
County Fee $374.00
Extra Pages $-
Postage $-
Chattel $-
TOTAL $1,268.00

DRAWER Drawer 3
CLERK ECP
ATTACHMENT #8

Public Hearing Notice:
List of Neighboring Property Owners
### Variance Notification List

**2666 Persimmon Pond Court**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Owner(s) of Record</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2656 Persimmon Pond Court</td>
<td>James R. &amp; Monique B. Sporn</td>
<td>2656 Persimmon Pond Court</td>
<td>Seabrook Island</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>29455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2646 Persimmon Pond Court</td>
<td>Tracy E. &amp; Michael J. Thorne</td>
<td>2646 Persimmon Pond Court</td>
<td>Seabrook Island</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>29455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2657 Persimmon Pond Court</td>
<td>Linda M. McCarter</td>
<td>PO BOX 1964</td>
<td>Johns Island</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>29457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2647 Persimmon Pond Court</td>
<td>Jeanette E. Davis, James M. Hatley Jr. &amp; Kathleen D. Hatley</td>
<td>104 Aspen Lane</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>29212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2637 Persimmon Pond Court</td>
<td>Patricia V. Linton</td>
<td>16 Leamington Street</td>
<td>Lido Beach</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>11561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3133 Laughing Gull Court</td>
<td>Lawrence A. &amp; Marilyn Jo Margolis (Trustees)</td>
<td>5115 Trimble Road NE</td>
<td>Sandy Springs</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>30342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3134 Laughing Gull Court</td>
<td>Susan N. &amp; Alvah O. Rock (Trustees)</td>
<td>40 Awixa Avenue</td>
<td>Bay Shore</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>11706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3132 Laughing Gull Court</td>
<td>John B. &amp; Rosemary E. Roche</td>
<td>1180 Bridge Pointe Lane</td>
<td>Yorktown Heights</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>10598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3125 Privateer Creek Road</td>
<td>Richard &amp; Kimberly Helms</td>
<td>3125 Privateer Creek Road</td>
<td>Seabrook Island</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>29455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3119 Privateer Creek Road</td>
<td>James M. &amp; Kathleen D. Hatley</td>
<td>2647 Persimmon Pond Court</td>
<td>Seabrook Island</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>29455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Hearing Notice:
U.S.P.S. Certified Mail Receipts
Public Hearing Notice:
Post & Courier Legal Ad
TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND
2001 SEABROOK ISLAND RD
JOHNS ISLAND SC 29455
Attn: Faye Allbritton

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

The Post and Courier

State of South Carolina  County of Charleston

Personally appeared before me the undersigned advertising clerk of the above indicated newspaper published in the city of Charleston, county and state aforesaid, who, being duly sworn, says that the advertisement of

(copy attached)

appeared in the issues of said newspaper on the following day(s):

04/01/18 Sun PC
04/01/18 Sun CNW

at a cost of $119.64
Account# 108294
Order# 1679926
P.O. Number:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of April 2018

[Signature]

Advertising Clerk

NOTARY PUBLIC, SC
My commission expires 09/24/2023
ATTACHMENT #11

Public Hearing Notice: Property Posting
Letter from Eric L. Ison
(March 1, 2018)
March 1, 2018

Mr. Ronald Ciancio  
Mayor  
Town of Seabrook Island  
2001 Seabrook Island Road  
Seabrook Island, SC 29455  
rciancio@townofseabrookisland.org

Mr. Joseph M. Cronin  
Town Administrator  
Town of Seabrook Island  
2001 Seabrook Island Road  
Seabrook Island, SC 29455  
jcronin@townofseabrookisland.org

Mr. Stephen L. Brown, Esq.  
Young Clement Rivers, LLP  
25 Calhoun St., Suite 400  
Charlestown, SC 29401  
sbrown@ycrlaw.com

Re: Variances With Respect to Lot at 2666 Persimmon Pond, Seabrook Island

Dear Gentlemen:

Writing this letter is not something my wife and I ever wanted to do, but we feel compelled to do so. We offer this letter in advance of our meeting with you, the mayor, town administrator and outside counsel for the Town of Seabrook (“Seabrook”). What brings us here is the determination by Seabrook, through its town administrator, that all Seabrook lot variances, and in particular the variances granted by Seabrook on February 5, 1993 for our lot at 2666 Persimmon Pond (the “Variances”), expire two years after they had been granted. In our case, this would render our lot unbuildable and “of virtually no value.” As far as we can tell, in its history, Seabrook has never held this position until the week of February 5, 2018 when we learned of it as it affects our lot and the Variances, first from our architect who was told of it by the town administrator, and then directly from the town administrator on February 14, 2018, in a face to face meeting we requested.

The purpose of this letter is first and foremost to ask you to change your position and acknowledge that the Variances are in full force and effect and restore the status quo as it existed prior to Seabrook taking this new position. Failing this, we want to make it clear through this letter how we have been, and will continue to be damaged by Seabrook’s action, why we think Seabrook is wrong and what actions come into play to remedy the damage to us.

The central point of the disagreement is the town administrator’s conclusion that under the Seabrook Developmental Standards Ordinance (SDSO), variances expire two years after they are granted. This interpretation equates a variance with a “site specific development plan” and treats
them as the same thing. Unlike a “site specific development plan” which is personal to the property owner and expires two years after the date of final approval of the plan, variances run with the land and are permanent, absent a limitation in the grant of the variances. There was no time limitation in the 1993 grant of the Variances, and the SDSO does not provide otherwise or invalidate the Variances. If a variance and a “site specific development plan” are treated as distinct matters, as they factually and legally are, the Variances will continue in effect. On this basis alone this matter can be, and should be, settled, and we can be free to proceed to build our home on our lot as planned.

If this matter cannot be resolved on the basis stated above, various causes of action will need to be evaluated which we will do briefly below.

Allow us first to give some background information to better put all of this in context:

My wife, Melanie Bootes, and I reside in Louisville, Kentucky with our eight year old son. I graduated from the University of the South and obtained my law degree from Vanderbilt University. I practice law with the law firm of Bingham Greenebaum Doll LLP. Melanie graduated from Clemson University and obtained her law degree from the University of Louisville. She is the Chief Legal Officer for KFC.

We purchased a home on Crooked Oaks Lane in Seabrook in 2014 using the good services of Stuart Rumph as our real estate agent. In 2016 we began exploring Seabrook for a home with a marsh view again using Stuart for this purpose. Stuart introduced us to the marsh view lot at 2666 Persimmon Pond which one of his clients had listed for sale. Stuart was clear in telling us that this lot was uniquely shaped and was unbuildable without the approved Variances which were in place. His client was a real estate lawyer and received confirmation from the Seabrook town administrator before he purchased the lot that the Variances were valid. Our seller intended to build on the lot and in 2007 obtained final approval from Seabrook of a site specific development plan which relied on and included the existing Variances. Our seller subsequently purchased elsewhere on Seabrook and listed the lot for sale.

Before purchasing the lot, among other steps: (i) we reviewed the written grant of the Variances which expressly finds that “without variances the lot is of virtually no value.”; (ii) we reviewed our seller’s approved site plan; and (iii) we hired our current architect, Tyler Smyth, to confirm the validity of the Variances and to provide us with an architectural site analysis plotting the Variances to show where our home could be built on the lot. In May of 2016, Mr. Smyth, on our behalf, conferred with the then, and long time, town administrator, Randy Pierce, who confirmed and represented to Mr. Smyth that the Variances were valid and in effect. Mr. Smyth memorialized this representation contemporaneously with when it was made. All those associated with the sale to us of the lot knew that without the Variances the lot had little or no value, and but for the Variances we would not have purchased it. With the express and implied
representations regarding the Variances, our review of the written grant of the Variances and the longstanding existence without change of the Variances, we purchased the lot on June 16, 2016 for $340,000.00.

We proceeded forward with steps to put us in a position to build our marsh-view home. This included incurring further expenses for the architectural services of Mr. Smyth (five figures) who prepared additional drawings and plans and submitted them to the Seabrook Architectural Review Committee (ARC) along with our payment of the $2,500.00 filing fee. As part of the approval process with the ARC, we were required to have the lot staked to locate the improvements based on the existing Variances, which we did at a cost of $1,000.00. We also incurred fees of $2,500.00 for necessary geotechnical services. On January 16, 2016, the ARC approved our Conceptual Plan and acknowledged the existence of the Variances in its written approval. On February 6, 2018, we concluded a successful Preliminary Hearing with the ARC.

In 2017, we listed our Crooked Oaks home for sale because we were not going to start building before we sold this house. In January of 2018, we lowered the sale price in hopes of encouraging an offer so we could begin building. With the reduced sale price, we received such an offer which we accepted on January 8, 2018, and agreed to a closing on February 15, 2018. Our son’s winter break conveniently began the week of February 12, 2018, so we arranged to come to Seabrook on Friday, February 9, 2018 to clear out our belongings, to close on the sale and meet with and interview building contractors; all of which we did. It was on February 7, 2018 that the town administrator informed our architect that the Variances had expired. We were told this by the town administrator in the meeting we set up with him on Wednesday, February 14, 2018, the day before our closing.

Arising out of this background are the following issues:

1. **Damages.** Although real and painful, at this point in time the damages we have experienced are more emotional than financial. If Seabrook reverses its position and does not challenge the Variances we can proceed forward with building plans without the need for relief for monetary damages. If, however, we are forced to go to a hearing to maintain the existing Variances or obtain other Variances, we will incur economic damages. A complete denial of the Variances will result in loss of our $340,000.00 investment, architectural expenses, staking expenses, the ARC filing fee and other damages. The delay caused by the hearing process will impact our ability to obtain a more favorable interest rate for construction financing and we will incur additional expenses and fees for professional services. If any ultimate grant of a variance differs from the existing Variances, our architectural plans will have to be changed and we will have to start the ARC process over. Our hope is that the issue of damages can be completely avoided.
2. **Detrimental Reliance.** We believe our position that we are entitled to the benefit of the Variances is clearly supported on the grounds that we reasonably relied to our detriment on the unaltered existence over time of the Variances, on the express and implied representations made in connection with the Variances, on historic precedent, and other matters on which we relied.

3. **Inverse Condemnation.** We believe the action by Seabrook would cause our property to be rendered virtually without value which amounts to a constructive taking of our property without just compensation.

4. **Denial of Equal Protection.** Others in our chain of title to the lot have enjoyed the benefit of the Variances. To deny us the same benefit is a denial of equal protection of the laws. This can be extended further to all the benefits enjoyed by all property owners with variances granted by Seabrook since 1993 which Seabrook has not treated as expiring after two years.

5. **Arbitrary and Selective Enforcement.** Seabrook acts arbitrarily in adopting the position that our Variances have expired and is selectively enforcing this new regulation against us.

6. **Classes of Property Owners Similarly Situated.** We would want to discover the number and identity of other owners of undeveloped lots in Seabrook with variances, and determine the length of time which has passed since they were granted. Also of relevance will be how many homes have been built since 1993 with variances which were older than two years at the time of construction. Arguably, under Seabrook’s new stance on variances, any variance which is older than two years cannot be relied on to add to existing structures or to rebuild if a structure has been destroyed. These classes of property owners would be subject to harm and need of relief similar to what we face.

We feel strongly that the announced action by the town of Seabrook to render the Variances invalid is wrong and fundamentally unfair. We request Seabrook to reverse its position and allow us to build on our lot with the full benefit of the existing Variances.
Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Eric L. Ison
Melanie Bootes

ELI/wcd
Letter from Eric L. Ison  
(March 9, 2018)
Gentlemen,
Melanie and I want to thank you again for meeting with us by phone last Friday. We wanted to confirm the following from our meeting:

1. The Town of Seabrook has taken the position that the variances granted by Seabrook in 1993 for our lot at 2666 Persimmon Pond have expired and are no longer valid. We disagree with Seabrook and believe the variances continue in full force and effect. We did not, and do not, waive or relinquish our position.

2. Seabrook proposed that we apply for new variances, that Seabrook would support our application and that our pursuit of the new variances would be with a full reservation of our rights.

3. We decided to apply for new variances, with full reservation of rights, and have taken Seabrook up on its invitation for our architect to meet with the Town Administrator to identify any potential areas of concern regarding the new variances and our application.

We appreciate the support of Seabrook and are optimistic that new variances which will accommodate our existing building plans with little or no change will be expeditiously granted, and we can resume the process of building our home.
Respectfully,
Eric Ison
Melanie Bootes

Eric Ison
Partner
Bingham Greenebaum Doll LLP
3500 PNC Tower | 101 South Fifth Street | Louisville, KY 40202
Direct: 502-587-3564 | Fax: 502-540-2161
Email: Eison@bgdlegal.com | http://www.bgdlegal.com
Follow us on Twitter | Visit our Blog: http://blog.bgdlegal.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE AND DISCLOSURES:
This e-mail contains information that is privileged, confidential and subject to legal restrictions and penalties regarding its unauthorized disclosure or other use. You are prohibited from copying, distributing or otherwise using this information if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and delete this email and all attachments from your system. If this e-mail, including any attachments, contains any federal tax advice, that advice is not intended or written to be used and it may not be used for the purpose of avoiding penalties that the Internal Revenue Service may impose unless it was written for that purpose and specifically so states. Also, any federal tax advice (including any in an attachment) may not be used or referred to in promoting, marketing or recommending a transaction or arrangement to another party unless written for that purpose and specifically so states. Further information concerning this disclosure may be obtained upon request from the author of this e-mail. Thank you.

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a safer and more useful place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more Click Here.
Variance Application
(1993)
TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND—VARIANCE REQUEST

DATE: 1/23/93          VARIANCE REQUEST NO. VA: 31          FEE: $25.00

FEE PAID: 1/25/93

Buyer: Robert E. Bonette

Contract Owner: Robert E. & Andrea M. Bonette

PHONE: 609-466-0641

ADDRESS STREET: 17 Ridge Road, Hopewell, NJ 08525

LOT: 38          BLOCK: 5          TMS: 147:01:00:069

TO BE PLACED ON AGENDA DATE: 2/5/93          TIME:

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT: X

PLANNING & ZONING:

VARIANCE REQUEST—DESCRIBE (NOTE—THE REQUEST MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY A PLAT SHOWING LOT LINES AND ENCROACHMENT)

DESCRIPTION:

Bulk Variance request per attachment

IF MORE SPACE IS NEEDED PLEASE ATTACH TO THE FORM

ACTION:

Robert E. Bonette

APPLICANT

DATE: 1/23/93

Zoning Administrator

DATE: 1/25/93

60
Robert E. Bonette  
17 Ridge Road  
Hopewell, New Jersey 08525  
Tel: (609)466-0841

January 23, 1993

The Board of Adjustment  
Town of Seabrook Island

The following description relates to the bulk variance requested on Lot 38, Block 5.

It is our hope to place a house footprint of approximately 2780 square feet on this lot of approximately 22,000 square feet.

Because of the shape of this lot and the state of the C.C.C.A Line, both front and back setback as well as side setbacks are requested in order to build on this lot. The setback variances requested are:

Side yard setback permitted: 15 feet.  
Variance requested: 7 feet

Front setback permitted: 30 feet  
Variance requested: 18 feet to house structure, 15 feet to front deck/porch

Marsh setback from C.C.C.A. Line permitted: 25 feet  
Variance requested: 2 feet to pervious deck, 13 feet to house structure

I would appreciate the Board reviewing this application, with a decision to follow as soon as possible. I am not sure at this point whether I will be able to physically attend the Board meeting, but am asking that I be permitted to appoint a representative if unable to do so. For this reason, please advise when the Board will be able to hear this application.

A plat showing lot lines, permitted setbacks, house footprint, and encroachments is attached.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Bonette
ATTACHMENT #15

Proposed Site Plan
(1993)
ATTACHMENT #16

BOZA Variance Approval Letter
(1993)
TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

DATE: Feb. 5 1993

OWNER: (Buyer) Robert and Andra Bonnette
ADDRESS: 17 Ridge Road, Hopewell N. J.

TMB 147.01 02.039
lot 38, Block 5

ATTENDEES: E. M. Mahla, Chairman, Joe Bickle, Jack De Witt, Wayne Hackersmith

Martha Thornhill, for the lot owner, Jere Pugh, for the lot buyer, and Harold Dunham, observer.

VARIANCE REQUEST:

In order to build a house of approximately 2780 sq. ft. on this lot of approximately 22000 sq. ft. the following setback variances were requested:

- Side yard: 7 ft.
- Front: 18 ft.to house, 15 ft to front deck/porch
- Marsh setback: 2 ft. to C.C.C. A line from a pervious deck, 13 ft. to house structure.

This is a non-conforming lot and it is virtually impossible to build while conforming to all setback ordinances. Without variances the lot is of virtually no value. Thus a serious hardship exists. After much discussion and after examining other possible approaches to the problem, it was concluded that the buyers request was as reasonable as any other. The problem of rain water run-off, building so close to the C.C.C. A line, was of major concern to the committee, even though the Coastal Council allows building to the critical line. Therefore Wayne Hackersmith offered the following motion:

It was moved that the variances requested by the buyer be granted with the proviso that complete plans to control rain water run-off be included with the house plans for approval by the Zoning Administrator. The motion was seconded by Joe Bickle and unanimously approved.

Elbert M. Mahla, Chairman

Louis M. Favret, Secretary
ATTACHMENT #17

Original Site Plan (1993)
1993 Setback Requirements Shown
Proposed Site Plan (2018)
2018 Setback Requirements Shown
Original Site Plan (1993) vs.
Proposed Site Plan (2018)

2018 Setback Requirements Shown
Subdivision Plat for Persimmon Pond Court
(1978)
SEABROOK ISLAND

CHARLESTON COUNTY, S.C.

PLAT OF LOTS 35-41 BLOCK 5

SCALE 1" = 100'

APRIL 5, 1978

NOTE: ALL STREETS AND EASEMENTS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT ARE PRIVATE AND ARE TO BE MAINTAINED BY SEABROOK ISLAND COMPANY ITS SUCCESSORS OR ASSIGNS.

S.A. SEABROOK, JR.

S.A. SEABROOK, JR.
REGISTERED SURVEYOR OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

NOTES:
1. ALL CORNERS MARKED WITH IRON PIPES.
2. ALL CURVE MEASUREMENTS ARE TRUE LENGTHS
3. OWNED BY SEABROOK ISLAND COMPANY.
4. ADJUST = 5.071 A.
5. ALL CORNERS SHOWED ARE 20'.
6. ALL LOTS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT ARE ABOVE ELEVATION 40' MSL.
7. MINIMUM LOT SIZE = 14,075 SQ FT.

APPROVED FINAL PLAT

CHARLESTON COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

JUNE 6, 1978

#5560-RR
ATTACHMENT #19-A

Neighboring Property Information:
2637 Persimmon Pond Court
(Lot 35, Block 5)
### Current Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property ID (PIN)</th>
<th>Alternate ID (AIN)</th>
<th>Parcel Address</th>
<th>Data refreshed as of</th>
<th>Assess Year</th>
<th>Pay Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1470100072</td>
<td></td>
<td>2637 PERSIMMON POND RD, SEABROOK ISLAND</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Historic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$104,800</td>
<td>$447,300</td>
<td>$552,100</td>
<td>$7,302.63</td>
<td>$7,302.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$104,800</td>
<td>$447,300</td>
<td>$552,100</td>
<td>$7,018.81</td>
<td>$7,018.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$104,800</td>
<td>$447,300</td>
<td>$552,100</td>
<td>$6,652.17</td>
<td>$6,652.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$7,628.60</td>
<td>$7,628.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sales Disclosure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Deed</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WENRICH EDWARD W</td>
<td>N652 017</td>
<td>2/29/2008</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENRICH EDWARD W</td>
<td>A643 486</td>
<td>10/23/2007</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Constructed Year</th>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Finished Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Improvement Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R01</td>
<td>DWELL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighboring Property Information:
2647 Persimmon Pond Court
(Lot 36, Block 5)
Charleston County, South Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property ID (PIN)</th>
<th>Alternate ID (AIN)</th>
<th>Parcel Address</th>
<th>Data refreshed as of</th>
<th>Assess Year</th>
<th>Pay Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1470100071</td>
<td></td>
<td>2647 PERSIMMON POND RD, SEABROOK ISLAND</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Parcel Information**

- **Owner**: DAVIS JEANETTE E ETAL
- **Owner Address**: 104 ASPEN LN COLUMBIA SC 29212-8602
- **Property Class Code**: 101 - RESID-SFR
- **Acreage**: .0000
- **Legal Description**: Subdivision Name -SEABROOK ISLAND Description -LOT 36 BLK 5 PlatSuffix S-70 PolTwp 009

**Historic Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$444,000</td>
<td>$549,000</td>
<td>$7,261.25</td>
<td>$7,261.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$444,000</td>
<td>$549,000</td>
<td>$6,979.06</td>
<td>$6,979.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$444,000</td>
<td>$549,000</td>
<td>$6,614.53</td>
<td>$6,614.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$7,628.60</td>
<td>$7,628.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sales Disclosure**

- **Grantor**: FREUH BARTLEY C
  - **Book & Page**: S651 885
  - **Date**: 1/23/2008
  - **Deed**: G
  - **Sale Price**: $789,000
- **Grantor**: CAROLINA SOUTHERN PROPERTIES INC
  - **Book & Page**: B328 548
  - **Date**: 6/4/1999
  - **Deed**: G
  - **Sale Price**: $434,900
- **Grantor**: SEA COAST DEVELOPMENT INC
  - **Book & Page**: K286 447
  - **Date**: 6/27/1997
  - **Deed**: G
  - **Sale Price**: $48,500
- **Grantor**: NALBANTYAN MIGIRDIC
  - **Book & Page**: K286 401
  - **Date**: 6/27/1997
  - **Deed**: G
  - **Sale Price**: $26,500

**Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use Code Description</th>
<th>Constructed Year</th>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Finished Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Improvement Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R01</td>
<td>DWELL</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R01</td>
<td>ATTGAR</td>
<td>Attached Garage</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT #19-C

Neighboring Property Information:
2656 Persimmon Pond Court
(Lot 39, Block 5)

Note: This property has a non-conforming front and marsh setback
(Variance approved by BOZA in 1989)
Charleston County, South Carolina

Property ID (PIN) | Alternate ID (AIN) | Parcel Address | Data refreshed as of | Assess Year | Pay Year
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1470100068 | | 2656 PERSIMMON POND RD, SEABROOK ISLAND | 4/20/2018 | 2017 | 2017

Current Parcel Information

- **Owner**: SPORN JAMES R SPORN MONIQUE B
- **Property Class Code**: 101 - RESID-SFR
- **Owner Address**: 2656 PERSIMMON POND CT, JOHNS ISLAND SC 29455
- **Legal Description**: Subdivision Name -SEABROOK ISLAND Description -LOT 39 BLK 5 PlatSuffix S-70 PolTwp 009

Historic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$178,200</td>
<td>$806,500</td>
<td>$984,700</td>
<td>$3,669.75</td>
<td>$3,669.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$178,200</td>
<td>$806,500</td>
<td>$984,700</td>
<td>$3,453.11</td>
<td>$3,453.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$178,200</td>
<td>$806,500</td>
<td>$984,700</td>
<td>$3,638.24</td>
<td>$3,638.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$4,015.90</td>
<td>$4,015.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sales Disclosure

- **ERNSTROM JOHN R**: Book & Page 0239 692, Date 3/15/2012, Deed G, Sale Price $1,150,000
- **BINNEY DAVID G**: Book & Page Y498 441, Date 6/17/2004, Deed G, Sale Price $160,000
- **REEVES CAROL NEITHARDT**: Book & Page M189 192, Date 12/8/1989, Deed G, Sale Price $60,000

Improvements

- **Building**: R01
- **Type**: DWELL
- **Use Code**: Dwelling
- **Description**: 
- **Constructed Year**: 2008
- **Stories**: 2.0
- **Bedrooms**: 04
- **Finished Sq. Ft.**: 3,716
- **Improvement Size**: 

---

81

http://sc-charleston-county.govmax.com/svc/tab_summary_report_SC-Char.asp?PrintView=True&r_nm=tab%5Freport&t_wc=%7Cparcelid%3D1470100068+++++
NOTES:
1) AREA WAS DETERMINED BY THE COORDINATE METHOD.
2) ANYTHING SHOWN OUTSIDE THE DEFINED BOUNDARY IS FOR DESCRIPTIVE PURPOSE ONLY.
3) THE PUBLIC RECORDS REFERENCED ON THIS PLAT ARE ONLY USED AND/OR NECESSARY TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BOUNDARY OF THIS PROPERTY. THEY ARE NOT AND DO NOT CONSTITUTE A TITLE SEARCH.
4) DISTANCE SHOWN THEREON ARE HORIZONTAL GROUND DISTANCES.
5) NO SUBSURFACE OR ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION OR SURVEYS WERE PERFORMED FOR THIS PLAT. THEREFORE THIS PLAT DOES NOT REFLECT THE EXISTENCE OR NONEXISTENCE OF WETLANDS, CONTAMINATION, OR OTHER CONDITIONS WHICH MAY AFFECT THIS PROPERTY.

FLOOD NOTE:
THIS PROPERTY APPEARS TO BE LOCATED IN FLOOD ZONE "A".
PER F.S.A., FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP
SEE COMMUNITY MAP 45081C, PANEL 765 J
A SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREA, BASE FLOOD ELEVATION 13.0
MAP REVISED: NOV. 17, 2004

PRIVATEER CREEK

5.6' M.S.L. LINE
(PER REFERENCE)

L4
L3
L2

L1

LOT 40

LOT 38

85.70 A
S 87°33'23" W

PERSIMMON POND 50' R/W

EQUIPMENT USED: SOKKIA TOTAL STATION
AREA: 10,058.71 SQ FT
0.23 ACRE
PRESSION: 1/302,504.00
FIELD WORK COMPLETED: 02/29/2008

40 20 0 40
SCALE: 1" = 40'

LINE BEARING DISTANCE
L1 N 42°20'02" W 15.76'
L2 S 87°35'14" E 15.75'
L3 N 51°12'26" E 29.12'
L4 N 63°27'10" E 40.68'
L5 S 68°7'23" E 45.75'
L6 N 61°18'32" E 22.32'
L7 N 35°16'39" E 10.95'
L8 S 04°20'35" W 8.72'

I hereby state that to the best of my knowledge, information and belief,
the survey shown hereon was made in accordance with the requirements of "THE MINIMUM STANDARDS MANUAL FOR THE PRACTICE OF LAND SURVEYING IN SOUTH CAROLINA," and meets or exceeds the requirements for a Class "A" survey as specified therein. Also there are no visible encroachments or projections other than shown. This certification includes all notes and comments placed hereon. Witness my original signature, registration number and seal this 3rd day of March, 2008.

SEABROOK ISLAND FINAL ASBUILT
CHARLESTON COUNTY, S.C.

SEABROOK ISLAND

PLAT OF LOT 39,
BLOCK 5, KNOWN AS
TM #147-11-00-068

PLAT REFERENCE:
1. A PLAT BY A.H. SCHWACKE & ASSOC.
DATED 12/12/2003, REVISED 11/29/2005
TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

June 15, 1989

To Mr. James Williamson, Zoning Administrator

Town of Seabrook Island

This is in reply to a request for variance from the setback requirements as set forth in the Town's "Land Use and Zoning Development Standards Ordinance in effect as of this date. The request was submitted and reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission and referred to the Board of Adjustment for action. The Board reviewed this request on April 27, 1989.

Request from Mr. J. B. Reeves; 2717 Picardy Pl.
Charlotte, NC 28209
Lot 39, Block 5 Located in the Town of Seabrook Island
Persimmon Pond

The front and rear set backs as defined in the ordinance for this lot are adjusted to:

Front ... 25 feet
Rear ... 10 feet

This approval for variance requires that special consideration for drainage and sheet flow of water from the structures shall be provided as deemed necessary by the Zoning Administrator, to assure that this relaxation of the set backs does not injure the lot or the environment.

This approval is given based upon the information provided and reviewed during the meeting of April 27, 1989 and recorded in the minutes of that meeting.

Approved:

Elbert M. Mahla, Chairman
Louis M. Pavret

Joseph W. Bickel
Barbara J. Pressler

cc: Joel W. Thompson, Mayor
Warren D. Watts, Chrmn. Zoning & Planning Commission
Members of Board of Adjustments
ATTACHMENT #19-D

Neighboring Property Information:
2646 Persimmon Pond Court
(Lot 40, Block 5)
### Current Parcel Information

**Owner**
- THORNE TRACY, THORNE MICHAEL J

**Owner Address**
- 2646 PERSIMMON POND CT
  - SEABROOK ISLAND SC 29455

**Property Class Code**
- 101 - RESID-SFR

**Acreage**
- 0.0000

**Legal Description**
- Subdivision Name -SEABROOK ISLAND
  - Description -LOT 40 BLK 5
  - Description -LOT 40 BLK 5
  - PlatSuffix S-70 PolTwp 009

### Historic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$745,000</td>
<td>$1,105,000</td>
<td>$4,105.73</td>
<td>$4,105.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$1,226.16</td>
<td>$1,226.16</td>
<td>$1,226.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$4,272.48</td>
<td>$4,272.48</td>
<td>$4,272.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td>$3,716.60</td>
<td>$3,716.60</td>
<td>$3,716.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sales Disclosure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Deed</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SZVETECZ THOMAS S</td>
<td>0423 999</td>
<td>8/18/2014</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SZVETECZ THOMAS S</td>
<td>G464 800</td>
<td>8/21/2003</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTA THOMAS J III</td>
<td>G173 314</td>
<td>2/23/1988</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Constructed Year</th>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Finished Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Improvement Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R01</td>
<td>DWELL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>3,874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARCH AREA 4,176.6 SQ. FT. 0.11 ACRES
HIGHLAND AREA 12,534.1 SQ. FT. 0.29 ACRES
TOTAL LOT AREA 17,710.7 SQ. FT. 0.40 ACRES

REFERENCES
PLAT BY E.M. SEABROOK, JR
DATED OCTOBER 25, 1977
BOOK AJ PAGE 144
RMC CHAS. CO.

TAX MAP No. 147-01-00-067
2045 PERSIMMON POND ROAD
SEABROOK ISLAND
CURRENT OWNERS:
TRACY E & MICHAEL J THORNE

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD: THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO GRANT VARIANCES RESPECTING SETBACK GUIDELINES AND/OR TO EXPAND THE "BUILDABLE" AREA.

THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS JURISDICTIONAL WETLANDS IS UNDETERMINED AS OF THE DATE OF THIS SURVEY.

NOTE:
BEARINGS SHOWN ARE MAGNETIC NORTH AND SUCH ARE SUBJECT TO LOCAL ATTRACTION.

CONTOUR LINE
LOT 40

PERSIMMON POND ROAD
(50' R/W)

LEGEND:
I.O., IRON OLD (FOUND)
I.N., IRON NEW (SET)
HVAC HEAT/AC HEATING/COOLING UNIT
R/W RIGHT OF WAY
MAGNETIC NORTH

LOT COVERAGE:
RESIDENCE = 2,789.0 sq.ft.
SCREENED PORCH = 251.1 sq.ft.
FRONT STEPS = 111.7 sq.ft.
BACK DECK & STEPS = 788.1 sq.ft.
TOTAL LOT COVERAGE = 3,761.3 sq.ft.

HIGHLAND AREA = 12,534.1 sq.ft.
(40.4% COVERAGE)

DIHEC-OCRMA CERTIFICATION
THE AREA SHOWN ON THIS PLAT IS A REPRESENTATION OF DEPARTMENT PERMIT AUTHORITY ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. ALL MASKS BY THEIR NATURE ARE DYNAMIC AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE OVER TIME. BY DELEGATING THE PERMIT AUTHORITY TO THE DEPARTMENT, THE DEPARTMENT IN NO WAY WAIVES ITS RIGHT TO ASSIST PERMIT JURISDICTION AT ANY TIME IN ANY CRITICAL AREA ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, WHETHER SHOWN HEREIN OR NOT.

SIGNED BY: WILLIAM C. EISER
7/31/2014

The critical line shown on this plot is valid for five years from the date of this signature, subject to the cautionary language above.

PLAT OF SURVEY
OF LOT 40 BLOCK 5
SEABROOK ISLAND SUBDIVISION
TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND
CHARLESTON COUNTY SOUTH CAROLINA

DATE: MAY 2, 2016
SCALE: 1" = 30'

SURVEYOR’S CERTIFICATION
I hereby state that to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, the survey shown hereon was made in accordance with the requirements of the Standards of Practice Manual for Surveying in South Carolina, and meets or exceeds the requirements for a Class _____ survey as specified therein. Also there are no visible encroachments or projections other than shown.

KEVIN M. SCHWACKE, Sr. PLS
S.C. Registration Number 20486

CERTIFICATIONS ARE NOT TRANSFERABLE TO ADDITIONAL INSTITUTIONS OR SUBSEQUENT OWNERS.
THIS PLAT IS COPYRIGHTED AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE ENTITY OR PERSON(S) SHOWN HEREIN. THIS PLAT REPRESENTS A SURVEY BASED ON THE LISTED REFERENCES ONLY AND IS NOT THE RESULT OF A TITLE SEARCH.

JPK\14490 LOT 40 BLK 5 SEABROOK ISLAND
ATTACHMENT #19-E

Neighboring Property Information:
2636 Persimmon Pond Court
(Lot 41/42, Block 5)

*Note: This property has a non-conforming marsh setback
(Constructed in 1986, prior to incorporation)*
### Current Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property ID (PIN)</th>
<th>Alternate ID (AIN)</th>
<th>Parcel Address</th>
<th>Data refreshed as of</th>
<th>Assess Year</th>
<th>Pay Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1470100066</td>
<td></td>
<td>2636 PERSIMMON POND CT, SEABROOK ISLAND</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Historic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$377,100</td>
<td>$353,000</td>
<td>$730,100</td>
<td>$2,745.89</td>
<td>$2,745.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$377,100</td>
<td>$353,000</td>
<td>$730,100</td>
<td>$2,585.29</td>
<td>$2,585.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$377,100</td>
<td>$353,000</td>
<td>$730,100</td>
<td>$2,722.53</td>
<td>$2,722.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$437,000</td>
<td>$807,000</td>
<td>$2,778.55</td>
<td>$2,778.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sales Disclosure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Book &amp; Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Deed</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIESTER DORIS J</td>
<td>K572 037</td>
<td>2/6/2006</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>$910,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFAFF FRANCES W LIVING TRUST</td>
<td>W429 069</td>
<td>12/16/2002</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>$572,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFAFF FRANCES W LIVING TRUST</td>
<td>R386 263</td>
<td>10/15/2001</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFAFF ROBERT F</td>
<td>R386 258</td>
<td>10/15/2001</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE ARVIS L</td>
<td>H153 522</td>
<td>4/1/1986</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Use Code Description</th>
<th>Constructed Year</th>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Finished Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Improvement Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R01</td>
<td>DWELL</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Letter from Patricia Linton
(April 9, 2018)
April 9, 2018

Mr. Joseph M. Cronin  
Town Administrator  
Town of Seabrook Island  
2001 Seabrook Island Road  
Seabrook Island, SC 29455

Re: Variance Request for Setbacks  
2666 Persimmon Pond Ct., Seabrook Island, SC 29455

Dear Mr. Cronin:

I am writing as the owner of 2637 Persimmon Pond Court which is directly opposite captioned address. Welcome to the view of said property from my kitchen:

The sign in the picture alerts the neighbors of the public hearing to be held on May 4, 2018 at 2:30pm and it is to this meeting that I address my brief comments.
I believe the setback variances requested offend the community standards of Seabrook and are more consistent with Brooklyn, NY where houses are built to the curb and neighbors can hear each others’ conversations through their adjacent windows.

The front yard setback is particularly egregious as it juts the house into the street and ruins the beautiful spacious uniformity of the cul-de-sac's open feel. The proposed side yard setbacks will squeeze the house into the lot and disparage everyone’s green way and overwhelm their privacy. The rear/marsh proposed setbacks, based on OCRM lines from 25 years ago, are an outrageous intrusion into a conservation area and completely disregard the rampaging flooding that originated in that very location during Hurricane Matthew. The Hatleys residing at 2647 Persimmon Pond (803-261-1572) have video of this event they are willing to share with you.

The proposed variance requests reflect the over-reach of homeowners and builders. They diminish the beauty of the Island giving it development look. I purchased 2608 (in 2016) and 2606 Seabrook Island Road (in 2017) which I immediately donated to the Greenspace Conservancy to protect the privacy of my backyard and simultaneously preserve the luscious greenery, wildlife and light of the Island. No one here wants to live in a “Beazer Homes” community but without maintaining the safeguards in place and capitulating to disrespectful variance requests, that is what we will soon have.

What a shame to lose “what is uniquely ours” because a realtor wants to make a sale, a builder accesses outdated plat maps, a future homeowner does not know what sacrifices he is asking of his community or those with the power to promote preservation decline to do so. We believe the house should fit the lot and not variance the lot to shoe-horn the house. It would be best if the house was right-sized and positioned such that it can be built without compromising the town’s standards.

Respectfully,

*Patricia Linton*

Patricia Linton
Owner
2637 Persimmon Pond Court
Seabrook Island, SC 29455
Addendum 1

For further consideration, the State of SC recommends these guidelines page 14:

- Establish Non-Beachfront Shoreline Buffer Areas
- Establish 25-ft minimum buffer for all new developments along non-beachfront shorelines in the coastal zone
- Encourage local governments to establish or expand shoreline buffers

Adapting to Shoreline Change
A Foundation of Improved Management and Planning In SC
Final Report of the Shoreline Change Management Committee
April 2010
SC Dept of Health and Environmental Control


Addendum 2

Critical Line Buffer Ordinances:
Guidance for Coastal Communities


Page 7

Significant scientific research, such as the Urbanization and Southeastern Estuarine Systems (USES) project conducted in the South Carolina Lowcountry, has provided many results about the current state of water quality (and its impact on flora and fauna). These scientific results have provided recommendations that promote consistent protection of coastal water quality for human health. Several of these recommendations point to the use of wetland buffer ordinances (WBOs) to protect and improve water quality.

Page 15

The Benefits of Buffers
- Minimizes storm water pollution
- Reduces erosion
- Reduces heating of waterways
- Creates privacy
- Reduces flooding and flood damage
- Preserves natural habitat
- Saves money for homeowner through reduced maintenance cost
Letter from James & Kathleen Hatley
(April 19, 2018)
April 19, 2018

Mr. Joseph M. Cronin  
Town Administrator  
Town of Seabrook Island  
2001 Seabrook Island Road  
Seabrook Island, SC  29455

Re: Board of Adjustment Variance Request for Setbacks at 2666 Persimmon Pond Road:  
Dear Mr. Cronin:  
First of all, I would like to thank you for the time you spent with Kathy and myself on April 13, 2018 discussing the transition of setback variances that have occurred on Seabrook Island since the 1992-93 timeframe. This provided us with a much better understanding of the setback procedures and the specific request by Mr. Ison and Ms. Bootes.

The setback request references the 1992-93 variances that were established due to the high water lines of the marsh during that timeframe. This provided high water lines that extended more into the marsh area because the marsh was not nearly the height that it is currently. Also due to this lot's listing as non-conforming, this lot's house size was listed as approximately 2400 square feet only, to allow for the house to fit the lot appropriately.

But obviously things have changed over the last 26 years. Climate change is occurring and the seas are rising as the photos provided indicate the surge that flowed into the cul-de-sac during Irma. The majority of this water flowed from the 2666 Persimmon Pond lot and covered the entire area. That storm caused the area to be reviewed and now the high water restrictions have been moved several feet landwards from where they were just 3 years ago. We have seen this entire lot covered in water during the King tides and expect to see this again this June. All of this is mentioned because building any home on this lot will be difficult.

But our thoughts are not of the difficulties but the requested setbacks. The front setback is requested as 18 feet from the cul-de-sac which is only the approximate length of an automobile today. Every other home on this island has a much larger setback and this would damage the appearance of existing nearby homes along with the image of the island. If the board still approves the requested setbacks, we would request that since the 1992-93 variances were requested, the new home should be no larger than the 2400 square feet approved during that timeframe.

Thank you for your consideration.  
James M. Hatley  
Kathleen D. Hatley
Letter from Tina & Larry Mayland
(April 20, 2018)
Mr. Joseph M. Cronin  
Town Administrator  
Town of Seabrook Island  
2001 Seabrook Island Road  
Seabrook Island, SC 29455  

April 20, 2018

Re: Variance Request for Setbacks for 2666 Persimmon Pond Ct.

Dear Mr. Cronin,

We reside at 2636 Persimmon Pond Court. Since we will not be on Seabrook Island on May 4 for the public hearing, we wanted this letter to be read at the meeting. There are only 5 houses on our small cul-de-sac street, so the addition of this house will impact all of us. We welcome our new neighbors. Regarding their request that they be granted a variance, we feel strongly that homes built on Seabrook Island should fit the size of the lot and conform to the accepted Town & ARC guidelines. Granting a variance simply allows the setback rules to be broken in favor of one resident over the rest of the Seabrook residents. At that point, we have to ask why we have rules at all.

Our neighbor Patty Linton and we have both purchased lots adjacent to our homes (on the corner of Seabrook Island Road and Persimmon Pond) in order to insure the beauty of the street and to protect wildlife corridors for the benefit of the animals. Building a house that is too big for the 2666 lot negates both of these goals.

Please tell our future neighbors that we welcome them and hope that they understand that we simply request that they adhere to the building guidelines that are designed to preserve our unique community of Seabrook Island.

Sincerely,

Tina & Larry Mayland  
Full-time residents  
2636 Persimmon Pond Court
Letter from Larry & Marilyn Margolis
(April 23, 2018)
Mr. Joseph M. Cronin  
Town Administer  
Town of Seabrook Island  
2001 Seabrook Island Road  
Seabrook Island, SC 29455  

Re: Variance request for 2666 Persimmon Pond Ct., Seabrook Island, SC

Dear Mr. Cronin:

We are writing this letter regarding the variance application with respect to the property at 2666 Persimmon Pond Ct. We are Larry and Marilyn Margolis and we own the adjacent property along the marsh accessed from Laughing Gull Court.

To begin with, we are very sensitive to the investment made in the property by the applicants and their reliance, whether well placed or not, on the advice of others that the previous variance issued some 25 years ago and never acted on, could be relied on. We note however, that the variance granted 25 years ago was for a much smaller residence, was granted before the marsh encroachment which has occurred over the last several years, and before much of the newer construction that has occurred along the Persimmon Pond Court marsh view. (There have been three new houses that have been recently built along this marsh side of Persimmon Pond each creating an increasing strain on the local environment and its ability to hold flood waters.)

We are also very sensitive to the island’s environment and how it has changed over the years. We have already seen the dunes on the beach erode entirely and flooding in low lying areas of the island is a constant and increasing concern. Two lots on Laughing Gull, one adjoining our property to the South and the other adjoining the Burke’s property to the South are more often than not flooded and a breeding home for mosquitoes. They are frequently said to be unbuildable. We also are very much aware of the spreading marsh toward the homes all along our marsh side of the island from Gregg’s point to Camp St Cristopher. One need only look at the subject property where the OCRM line has already migrated over almost 30% of the property. The ongoing trend of the Southward migration of the marsh is not likely to reverse itself so any construction here has a more than usual risk associated with it.)
Finally, we are very concerned about the impact of the construction on the surrounding properties including our own. We know the lot frequently floods in very high tides and in storms with the water often flooding into the Persimmon Pond Ct. itself. Those waters migrate and pools in the lot south of us. Construction will undoubtedly mean importing truckloads of dirt to build up the lot where the proposed house is to be situated, but the water is inexorable and must go somewhere. What assurance or indemnity is there from the Applicants or the Town of Seabrook that the adjoining owner’s lots, or even homes, won’t be flooded or see even more advanced marsh migration and thereby diminished value? Circumstances have changed quite dramatically. The board must give due consideration to these dramatic changes that have occurred since the original variance was granted (again for a much smaller residence).

Finally, we are sensitive to the many surveys that have occurred concerning what makes Seabrook Island attractive. Those surveys underscore the natural beauty, serenity, availability of green space and the concern for wildlife as the most important attributes of our community. Building a larger home on a lot that in truth can not handle that size home is not conducive to the goals of the community. The zoning board should keep these larger community concerns in mind as well.

We believe this is a very difficult decision, but on balance for the reasons outlined above, we believe the variance, as requested, regrettably, is not advisable and should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry and Marilyn Margolis

mlmar@comcast.net
Larry’s cell: 770-329-4321
Letter from Susan Rock
(April 25, 2018)
April 25, 2018

Joseph Cronin, Town Administrator
Town of Seabrook
2001 Seabrook Island Rd.
Seabrook, SC 29455

RE: Board Variance Request for Setbacks at 2666 Persimmon Pond Rd.

Dear Mr. Cronin:

I am the trustee of the Susan N. Rock Revocable Trust that owns the property at 3134 Laughing Gull Ct. on Seabrook Island. As you are aware, Laughing Gull Ct. is the street just to the west of Persimmon Pond Rd. As a near neighbor to the property for which a variance is being sought, I have received notice of the request by Eric Ison and Melanie Bootes for the property at 2666 Persimmon Pond Rd. I am unable to attend the hearing on this request, so I am writing to express my concerns. While I understand the situation Mr. Ison and Ms. Bootes find themselves in, and I do feel sorry that this misunderstanding has occurred, I am adamantly opposed to the granting of this variance.

My husband and I have been property owners on Seabrook since 1986. We chose Seabrook as the place for our vacation home because of its natural beauty, its effort to preserve wildlife, its greenspace, and the proportional relationship of the homes to the property they cover. As time has gone on, larger and larger homes have been built. Many of them now appear disproportionate to the property they occupy. As Seabrook builds out with these larger homes, drainage has become a problem. There are two lots on Laughing Gull Ct. (numbers 3132 and 3136) which have become unbuildable as they are almost always underwater and serve mainly as breeding grounds for mosquitoes. Adding another very large home on an adjacent, very small lot only serves to increase the existing drainage problem.

When our neighbors, Larry and Marilyn Margolis, purchased their home at 3133 Laughing Gull Ct., they purchased it with an understanding of the existing setbacks. It seems blatantly unfair to them and other homeowners in the neighborhood to allow a very large home to be built so close property lines and the ever changing marsh we all share.

I respectfully ask that this variance not be granted.

Sincerely,

Susan Newcomb Rock

[Signature]

Susan Newcomb Rock
susannrock@gmail.com
631-968-4320