TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND
Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting
July 30, 2021 – 2:30 PM

Virtual Meeting (Zoom)
Watch Live Stream (YouTube)

Consistent with recommendations from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention related to “social distancing,” this meeting will be conducted virtually via Zoom.

Participate in the Virtual Public Hearing: Individuals who wish to participate in the virtual Public Hearing via Zoom may access the meeting as follows:

- Instructions for Joining & Participating in the Virtual Public Hearing
- To join by computer, tablet or mobile device: Click here to access Zoom Meeting
- To join by phone: Call (646) 558-8656 *Please note that long distance rates may apply*
- Meeting ID: 818 6903 5202   Passcode: 199268

Submit a Written Comment: Individuals who wish to submit a comment in advance of the Public Hearing may do so in writing by 12:00 pm on the day of the meeting using one of the following options:

- Online: Variance #175
- Email: jcronin@townofseabrookisland.org
- Mail or Hand Deliver: 2001 Seabrook Island Road, Seabrook Island, SC 29455

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting: June 29, 2021   [Pages 3–4]

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. Variance #175   [Pages 5–261]

  APPLICANT: Reynolds-Williams at Marshwood LLC (Owner)
              Keith Murphy (Applicant)
  ADDRESS: N/A Marshwalk Trace
  TAX MAP NUMBER: 149-01-00-092
  ZONING DISTRICT: PUD / MF Multi-Family Residential
  CODE SECTION: § 7.60.50. Marsh Setbacks (25 feet required)
§ 9.40.10. Marsh Area Requirements (Natural or planted ground cover required within 25 feet of marsh)

§ 10.30. Buffering of Incompatible Land Uses (50 feet required)

VARIANCE REQUEST:

To reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to 10 feet (15-foot encroachment) to allow for construction of a driveway and vehicular parking area;

To reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to approximately 18 feet (7-foot encroachment) to allow for construction of an attached multi-family residence ("Unit 8");

To reduce the marsh setback for open decks from 15 feet to 7 feet (8-foot encroachment) to allow for the encroachment of an open deck ("Unit 8"); and

To eliminate the required 50-foot landscaped buffer along the shared property line with TM # 149-01-00-093 (Seabrook Island Racquet Club tennis courts)

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

There are no Items for Information / Discussion

ADJOURN
TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND
Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting
June 29, 2021 – 2:30 PM

Virtual Meeting Hosted via Zoom
Live Streamed on YouTube

MINUTES

Present: Walter Sewell (Chair), John Fox (Vice Chair), Janet Gorski, Bob Leggett, Tom Pinckney, Joe Cronin (Zoning Administrator)

Absent: Bob Leggett

Guests: Keith Murphy (Applicant), Katrina Burrell

Chairman Sewell called the meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals to order at 2:30 PM. Zoning Administrator Cronin confirmed that the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were fulfilled, and the meeting was properly posted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting: June 11, 2021: Ms. Gorski made a motion to approve the minutes from the June 11, 2021, meeting. Mr. Fox seconded the motion. The motion was APPROVED by a vote of 4-0.

PENDING VARIANCE REQUESTS

Zoning Administrator Cronin distributed copies of the following variance application to members of the Board and provided a brief overview of the request:

- Variance #175 (Tax Map # 149-01-00-092): Request to reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to 10 feet (15-foot encroachment) to allow for construction of a driveway and vehicular parking area; to reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to approximately 18 feet (7-foot encroachment) to allow for construction of an attached multi-family residence (“Unit 8”); to reduce the marsh setback for open decks from 15 feet to 7 feet (8-foot encroachment) to allow for the encroachment of an open deck (“Unit 8”); and to eliminate the required 50-foot landscaped buffer along the shared property line with TM # 149-01-00-093 (Seabrook Island Racquet Club tennis courts)

Chairman Sewell asked who would receive the public notice since the property was surrounded mostly by multi-family regimes. Zoning Administrator Cronin responded that the notice would be sent by certified mail to each regime. He added that he had also obtained the email address for each regime president or chair from COVAR and would send notice via email as well.
Chairman Sewell asked where the public hearing signs would be placed. Zoning Administrator Cronin responded that one sign would be placed at each street frontage. Therefore, there would be one on Long Bend Drive and another at the access from Marsh Walk Villas.

Mr. Fox asked why the notice wasn’t being provided to all property owners within the neighboring regimes. Zoning Administrator Cronin responded that the DSO requires the notice to be provided to the owners within two parcels on all four sides. Therefore, only a couple units closest to the property would receive a notice, not all owners within the regime. The preferred approach would ensure that all surrounding regimes would receive public notice of the pending request and could share that information with its members.

Chairman Sewell noted that the public hearing would be held “virtually” due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. He stated that the Board will be able to receive verbal comments via the Zoom platform, similar to a traditional public hearing. In addition, the town will continue to accept written comments in advance of the meeting via the following options:

- **ONLINE**: [www.townofseabrookisland.org](http://www.townofseabrookisland.org)
- **EMAIL**: jcronin@townofseabrookisland.org
- **MAIL**: Town of Seabrook Island, 2001 Seabrook Island Road, Seabrook Island, SC 29455

All written comments will be read into the public record during the hearing on July 30, 2021.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION**

There were no Items for Information / Discussion

Chairman Sewell noted that the next meeting was scheduled for Friday, July 30, 2021, at 2:30 PM. He requested that members make arrangements to visit the property prior to the next meeting.

There being no further business, Ms. Gorski made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Fox seconded the motion. The motion to adjourn the meeting was **APPROVED** by a vote of 4-0 and the meeting was adjourned at 2:41 PM.

Minutes Approved:

Joseph M. Cronin  
Zoning Administrator
MEMORANDUM

TO: Town of Seabrook Island Board of Zoning Appeals Members
FROM: Joseph M. Cronin, Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator
SUBJECT: Variance Application # 175 – Tax Map # 149-01-00-092
MEETING DATE: July 30, 2021

Variance Application #174

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant(s)</th>
<th>Reynolds-Williams at Marshwood LLC (Owner)</th>
<th>Keith Murphy (Applicant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>N/A Marshwalk Trace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Map Number</td>
<td>149-01-00-092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning District</td>
<td>PUD / MF Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Section(s)</td>
<td>§ 7.60.50. Marsh Setbacks (25 feet required)</td>
<td>§ 9.40.10. Marsh Area Requirements (Natural or planted ground cover required within 25 feet of marsh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ 10.30. Buffering of Incompatible Land Uses (50 feet required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Request</td>
<td>To reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to 10 feet (15-foot encroachment) to allow for construction of a driveway and vehicular parking area;</td>
<td>To reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to approximately 18 feet (7-foot encroachment) to allow for construction of an attached multi-family residence (“Unit 8”); To reduce the marsh setback for open decks from 15 feet to 7 feet (8-foot encroachment) to allow for the encroachment of an open deck (“Unit 8”); and To eliminate the required 50-foot landscaped buffer along the shared property line with TM # 149-01-00-093 (Seabrook Island Racquet Club tennis courts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview

The Town has received a variance application from Reynolds-Williams at Marshwood LLC (hereafter, the “Owner”), the current owner of Charleston County Tax Map # 149-01-00-092 (hereafter, the “Property”). The current Owner purchased the property from Wood Development Inc. in 2009. The Property is now under contract for sale to Keith Murphy (hereafter, the “Buyer”) who, along with the Owner, are collectively referred to as the “Applicants.” The Buyer is seeking to acquire the Property for the purpose of developing up to 12 multi-family homes.

The Property is located off Long Bend Drive and is currently vacant. It borders the Marsh Walk Villas Horizontal Property Regime to the north and west and the Club at Seabrook Island’s Racquet Club.
facilities to the south. A portion of the property to the north and east is located within an area designated by SCDHEC-OCRM as a marsh critical area. The total area of the property is 1.824 acres.

The property is currently zoned PUD/MF Multi-Family. Under § 7.60.50 of the Development Standards Ordinance (hereafter, the “DSO”), multi-family residential units are a permitted use in this location, subject to the following conditions (in addition to meeting all other general requirements of the DSO):

§ 7.70.10. Attached Construction. If attached construction is used, multi-family dwellings shall meet the following requirements:

§ 7.70.11. There shall be no more than seven (7) dwelling units per gross acre devoted to unit home development, including internal streets, parking, drainage, and common use areas. \( \text{(1.824 acres} \times 7 \text{ DUA = Up to 12 Dwelling Units)} \)

§ 7.70.12. There shall be no more than three (3) dwelling units per building, attached by a common dividing wall(s) from ground to roof to one or more units. Separate access shall be available for each unit from the exterior.

§ 7.70.13. Each dwelling unit shall be designed for, and occupied as, a residence by one family.

§ 7.70.14. Each attached dwelling unit must have a minimum size of twelve hundred (1,200) square feet of heated area.

§ 7.70.15. The development must comply with the site plan review requirements as set forth in Article 14 of this Ordinance, including the final site plan submissions.

§ 7.70.16. All dwelling units must share a common regime for maintenance and landscaping.

As part of its due diligence, the Buyer prepared a site plan for preliminary review by the town prior to closing on the purchase of the Property (See Attachment 3). Upon reviewing the site plan, the Zoning Administrator determined that the proposed development plans would not conform to multiple zoning requirements, including:

- A portion of the driveway and vehicular parking area would encroach up to 15 feet into the required 25-foot marsh setback.

  - **Code Reference #1: DSO § 7.60.50. Marsh Setbacks**

    The minimum setback for a structure, exclusive of open decks, on a lot abutting the marsh shall be twenty-five (25) feet from the South Carolina Ocean and Coastal Resource Management critical area or the lot line, whichever is landward. No part of an open deck shall be closer than fifteen (15) feet from the critical area.
• A portion of “Unit 8” would encroach up to 7 feet into the required 25-foot marsh setback and up to 8 feet into the required 15-foot marsh setback for open decks.

• The required 50-foot landscaped buffer was not included between the proposed multi-family development and the neighboring Seabrook Island Racquet Club tennis courts.

• The Applicants have applied to the Board of Zoning Appeals for consideration of multiple variances. The purpose of this request is to seek relief from the following requirements of the DSO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED PER DSO</th>
<th>VARIANCE (REQUESTED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Setback</td>
<td>§ 7.60.50</td>
<td>Reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to 10 feet (15-foot encroachment) to allow for construction of a driveway and vehicular parking area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Header</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Setback</td>
<td>§ 7.60.50</td>
<td>Reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to approximately 18 feet (7-foot encroachment) to allow for construction of an attached multi-family residence (“Unit 8”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Setback</td>
<td>§ 7.60.50</td>
<td>Reduce the marsh setback for open decks from 15 feet to 7 feet (8-foot encroachment) to allow for the encroachment of an open deck (“Unit 8”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Area Requirements</td>
<td>§ 9.40.10</td>
<td>Modify the requirements of § 9.40.10 to for portions of the development where one or more variances have been authorized so as to exempt those areas from the requirement to retain natural ground cover, or to plant and maintain such areas with grass or similar groundcover, when such areas are located within twenty-five (25) feet of wetlands, marsh or typical marsh vegetation as determined by SCDHEC-OCRMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffering of Incompatible Land Uses</td>
<td>§ 10.30</td>
<td>Eliminate the required 50-foot landscaped buffer along the shared property line with TM # 149-01-00-093 (Seabrook Island Racquet Club tennis courts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their application, the Applicants have argued that strict application of the zoning requirements will result in an unnecessary hardship, and the standards for a variance set by state law and the DSO are met by the following facts:

- When the 50-foot incompatible land use buffer (adjacent to the tennis courts) is combined with the OCRM and wetland setbacks, the buildable area of the lot is decreased by approximately 60%. The incompatible land use buffer will also restrict access to the property from Long Bend Drive.

- Condominium buildings located within the adjacent Marsh Walk Villas development are within a few feet of the tennis courts and do not allow for a 50' buffer separation. Through GIS observation by the Civil Engineer, the buildings within the Marsh Walk Villas development also appear to overstep their 25' OCRM marsh setback.

- The application of the zoning requirements to this particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonable restrict utilization of the property by allowing approximately 4 townhomes of similar size and prohibiting access from Long Bend Drive.

- The adjacent property are the existing two tennis courts which are fenced and are not equipped with lighting. The neighboring Marsh Walk Villas development is already non-compliant with the 50-foot buffer, and the new townhomes would comply with the 25-foot setback from the neighboring residential units. Proposed decks would protrude less than 15 feet into the OCRM Marsh Setback on 2 units (8 and 10). Careful care and consideration
will be implemented for all landscape elements to create as much buffer as possible between the tennis courts and this development. Plant choices will be carefully picked to fit the local flora of Seabrook Island. The proposed building designs will be respectful of all SIPOA guidelines, with the ultimate goal of enhancing the overall unique character of Seabrook Island.

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. We do, however, feel it appropriate to offer the following items as information and/or clarification:

- There were several references in the application to the conformity status of Marsh Walk Villas. For reference, the condominiums at Marsh Walk were constructed in 1984. The Town of Seabrook Island was not incorporated until 1987. Therefore, Marsh Walk Villas was developed under a different set of zoning requirements (Charleston County).

- The original plan for Marsh Walk Villas (1984) anticipated that the project would be developed in two phases. Phase 1, which was eventually built, included 32 multi-family units on 1.227 acres (26 units per acre). Phase 2, which was never built, was expected to include 7 additional buildings. Depending on whether these would be developed as 4- or 6-unit buildings (or some mixture of the two), this would have resulted in 28 to 42 additional units, with a density ranging between 15.5 and 23.2 units per acre. The Property which is the subject to this variance request is the same property which was intended to be developed as the future phase 2 of Marsh Walk Villas. (See Attachment 4)

- There was another previous attempt to develop the Property in 2007-08. In January of 2007, Wood Development Inc. submitted a proposal to develop 11 multi-family units on the property. A new developer subsequently stepped in before any development plans were permitted and the proposed project received conditional approval from the Planning Commission on January 9, 2008. Though somewhat perplexing to current staff, the approved plan included only a 25-foot buffer from the tennis courts, despite the current ordinance which requires a 50-foot buffer being on the books since at least 1995. (There is no record of the Board of Zoning Appeals ever granting a variance to reduce the buffer requirement in 2007 or 2008.) The minutes of the January 9, 2008 Planning Commission meeting reflect that the applicant was scheduled to present the plan to the SIPOA ARC for approval 6 days later. The approved plans would then have been brought back to the Planning Commission for final approval. The town has no record of the project ever going back before the Planning Commission, and the project was likely shelved later in 2008 due to the economic downturn. The Property was subsequently sold to the current Owner, Reynolds-Williams at Marshwood LLC, in September 2009. Any “vested rights” attached to the project would have expired two years after preliminary approval. (See Attachment 16)
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 the Applicants and reviewed by the Board on July 30, 2021. Any modification to this site-specific plan prior to the issuance of a zoning permit, including those which may be required as part of the Site Plan Review process outlined in Article 14 of the DSO, shall require further review and approval by the Board of Zoning Appeals prior to permitting. Minor corrections, modifications and/or deletions which conform to the requirements of the town’s DSO may be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator.

- This variance, if approved, does not grant or guarantee any access to Long Bend Drive. Long Bend Drive is owned and maintained by the Seabrook Island Property Owners Association (SIPOA). Where required, any request to locate a new access driveway on Long Bend Drive must be approved by the road’s owner prior to final site plan approval and may be subject to additional conditions or requirements imposed by the owner, if any.

- Any driveway or vehicular parking area which encroaches into a 25-foot marsh setback shall be constructed of pervious materials.

- The Applicants shall install enhanced landscaping and/or screening material along the shared property line with the Club at Seabrook Island so as to meet the intent of the buffer requirement. The landscaping plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission as part of the Site Plan Review process outlined in Article 14 of the DSO.

- The variance shall expire on July 30, 2023 (two years from the date of approval) if the Applicants fail to obtain a building permit on or before that date.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application &amp; Property Information</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Variance Application</td>
<td>13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Existing Site Information &amp; Survey</td>
<td>17-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Schematic Plans</td>
<td>22-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Property Photos</td>
<td>40-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Zoning Map</td>
<td>60-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aerial Image</td>
<td>62-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. FEMA Base Flood Elevations</td>
<td>64-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Title to Real Estate</td>
<td>66-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Property Information Card</td>
<td>73-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Public Hearing Notice – Letter to Neighboring Property Owners</td>
<td>78-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Public Hearing Notice – List of Neighboring Property Owners</td>
<td>82-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Public Hearing Notice – USPS Certified Mail Receipts</td>
<td>84-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Public Hearing Notice – Post and Courier Legal Ad</td>
<td>86-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Public Hearing Notice – Property Posting</td>
<td>88-90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Information</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Items Related to Previous Development Plans (2007-08)</td>
<td>91-126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Correspondence Regarding the Proposed Variance Request</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17a Correspondence in Support of the Variance Request</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No Messages Received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b Correspondence in Opposition to the Variance Request</td>
<td>128-247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 91 Messages Received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17c Correspondence from SIPOA</td>
<td>248-249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 Message Received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17d Correspondence by Board of Zoning Appeals Members</td>
<td>250-261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6 Messages Received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variance Application
**TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND**  
2001 Seabrook Island Road  
Seabrook Island, SC 29455  
(843) 768-9121  

APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE  
Board of Zoning Appeals

Any applicant seeking a variance from the zoning requirements of the Town of Seabrook Island’s Development Standards Ordinance (hereafter, the “DSO”) must submit a written application, along with a $300.00 application fee and all required supplemental information. Applications must be typed or written legibly in ink. Please attach an additional sheet of paper if more space is needed. If you need assistance filling out this application form, please contact the Zoning Administrator by phone at (843) 768-9121 or by email at jcronin@townofseabrookisland.org.

### 1. PROPERTY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>0 Marshwalk Ave Trail, Seabrook Island, SC 29455</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Map Number</td>
<td>149-01-00-092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>1.824 acres (79,453 sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this property subject to an OCRM critical line? (eg. Marsh or Beachfront Lots)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this property subject to private restrictions or covenants? (eg. SIPOA or regime)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. APPLICANT(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name(s)</th>
<th>Keith Murphy, or assigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Address</td>
<td>7303 Three Chopt Rd, Richmond, VA 23226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Phone Number</td>
<td>804-517-1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmurphy@3north.com">kmurphy@3north.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Applicant is NOT an owner of the property, what is the relationship to the Property Owner(s)? Purchaser of property

### 3. PROPERTY OWNER(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name(s)</th>
<th>Reynolds-Williams At Marshwood, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Mailing Address</td>
<td>1169 Oyster Catcher Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Phone Number</td>
<td>843-243-0765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:myvisla@bellsouth.net">myvisla@bellsouth.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Designation of Agent (Required if the Applicant(s) is(are) NOT a Property Owner):** I (we) hereby designate and appoint the above named Applicant(s) as my (our) agent(s) to represent me (us) in this application.

Owner Signature(s)  
Date: 6/25/21

### 4. CERTIFICATION

Under penalty of perjury, I (we) hereby certify that the information contained in this application, including all supplemental materials, is true and accurate to the best of my (our) knowledge.

Applicant Signature(s)  
Date: 6/25/2021

### OFFICE USE ONLY

Date Filed:  
Variance Application #:  
Hearing Date:  

Variance Application (Rev. 07/2019)
5. VARIANCE REQUEST

A. Please provide a brief description of the proposed scope of work:

The proposed scope of work includes development and enhancements to the property to accommodate 12 custom high end townhomes in 2 and 3 unit configurations. A shared driveway entrance will allow site access from a southern entrance from Longbend Drive, and a secondary Western connection through an existing R.O.W. Easement.

B. In order to complete the proposed scope of work, the Applicant(s) is (are) requesting a variance from the following requirement(s) of the town’s DSO:

1) DSO Section Reference(s):

   §10.30.00 Buffering of Incompatible Land Use, § 7.60.50 Marsh Setback

2) DSO Requirement(s):

   §10.30.20 Buffer Requirements. The required buffer shall be a strip of landscape development at least fifty (50) feet in width, which shall be developed with the following § 7.60.50 Marsh Setbacks. The minimum setback for a structure, exclusive of open decks, on a lot abutting the marsh shall be twenty-five (25) feet from the South Carolina Ocean and Coastal Resource Management critical area or the lot line, whichever is landward. No part of an open deck shall be closer than fifteen (15) feet from the critical area § 9.40.10. All areas within twenty-five (25) feet of wetlands, marsh or typical marsh vegetation as determined by South Carolina Ocean and Coastal Resource Management critical base line shall retain their natural ground cover, or shall be planted and maintained with grass or similar groundcover. Disturbed ground cover shall be replaced following all construction activities.

C. The application of the zoning requirements of the town’s DSO will result in unnecessary hardship, and the standards for a variance set by State Law and the DSO are met by the following facts:

1) There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to this particular piece of property as follows:

   Provided "Seabrook Schematic Concept dated 5/10/2021" on pages 5 and 7. The adjacent Marshwalk Trace Condominium building is within a few feet of the tennis courts, and does not allow for a 50’ buffer separation. Through GIS observation by the Civil Engineer, the adjacent Marshwalk Trace also appears to overstep their 25’ OCRM Marsh Setback.

2) These conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity as shown by:

   Would not allow for a road access from Longbend Drive, and reduce the buildable land area by approximately 60%. This would limit the development of this property as currently proposed, and only allow for about 4 townhomes of similar size.

3) Because of these conditions, the application of the zoning requirements to this particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property as follows:

   The adjacent property are the existing two tennis courts which are fenced, and are not equipped with lighting. The neighboring condo property is already non-compliant with the 50’ buffer, and the new townhomes would be in compliance with a 25’ setback from the neighboring residential units. Proposed decks would protrude less than 15 feet into the OCRM Marsh Setback on 2 units (8 and 10). Careful care and consideration will be implemented for all landscape elements to create as much buffer as possible between the tennis courts and this development. Plant choices will be carefully picked to fit the local flora of Seabrook Island. The proposed building designs will be respectful of all SIPOA guidelines, with the ultimate goal of enhancing the overall unique character of Seabrook Island.

The adjacent property are the existing two tennis courts which are fenced, and are not equipped with lighting. The neighboring condo property is already non-compliant with the 50’ buffer, and the new townhomes would be in compliance with a 25’ setback from the neighboring residential units. Proposed decks would protrude less than 15 feet into the OCRM Marsh Setback on 2 units (8 and 10). Careful care and consideration will be implemented for all landscape elements to create as much buffer as possible between the tennis courts and this development. Plant choices will be carefully picked to fit the local flora of Seabrook Island. The proposed building designs will be respectful of all SIPOA guidelines, with the ultimate goal of enhancing the overall unique character of Seabrook Island.
6. APPLICATION MATERIALS

In addition to the completed Variance Application Form, all requests for variance must be accompanied by the supplemental materials listed below. An application is not considered “complete” until all required documentation has been received by the Zoning Administrator. Below is a checklist of the required materials:

- ✔ Completed & Signed Variance Application Form (Paper Required; PDF Optional)
  - Please submit one completed paper application. All signatures must be original.

- ✔ $300.00 Application Fee
  - The application fee may be paid by cash or check only.

- ✔ As-Built Survey / Survey of Existing Conditions (Paper Required; PDF Optional)
  - All applications must be accompanied by an as-built survey which accurately illustrates the existing conditions on the property, including setback measurements for all structures.

- ✔ Proposed Site Plan (Paper & PDF Required)
  - Required for all new structures and/or exterior modifications which will change the footprint of one or more existing structures.
  - For lots abutting a marsh or beachfront jurisdictional line, the location of the critical line must be certified by OCRM within the previous five (5) years.

- ✔ Scaled Architectural Drawings: (Paper & PDF Required)
  - Required for all new structures and/or exterior modifications to existing structures.
  - Architectural drawings must show, at a minimum:
    - A detailed floor plan or plan view; and
    - Front, side and rear elevations, as appropriate.

- ✔ Letter of Approval from Property Owners Association and/or Regime: (Paper Required; PDF Optional)
  - Required for all properties which are subject to private restrictions and/or covenants.
  - If approval is pending, please attach a Letter of Acknowledgement from the POA and/or Regime.

- ✔ Letters of support, petitions, photographs, and any other documentation which an Applicant feels may support his or her request may be attached but are not required. (Paper & Digital Files Optional)

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.

Variance Application (Rev. 07/2019)
ATTACHMENT #2

Existing Site Information & Survey
SITE INFORMATION
EXISTING SITE ADJACENCIES

SIVA, LLC | SEABROOK TOWNHOMES | SCHEMATIC CONCEPT | 10 MAY 2021
Schematic Plans
1. TMS # 149-01-00-092
2. SITE ACREAGE: 1.824
3. SETBACKS / BUFFERS:
   3.1. 15' MINIMUM BETWEEN BUILDINGS AND ADJACENT PROPERTIES
   3.2. MARSH/OCRMM CRITICAL LINE BUFFER: 25'
   3.3. WETLAND SETBACK: 10'
   3.4. ALLOWABLE LOT COVERAGE: 35%
   3.5. CURRENT LOT COVERAGE: 22%
4. DENSITY: 7 UNITS PER ACRE
   4.1. ALLOWABLE NUMBER OF UNITS: 12
   4.2. PROPOSED NUMBER UNITS: 12
   4.3. 3 UNITS PER ACRE
   4.4. MINIMUM 1200 SF HEATED SPACE
5. SITE PLAN PROVIDED BY ARCHITECT.
FLOOR PLAN GARAGE LEVEL
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ROOMS

- Covered Entrance: 4'-6" x 6'-5"
- Outdoor Storage: 3'-4" x 7'-0"
- Stair Hall with Storage: 13'-0" x 10'-10"
- Elevator: 4'-8" x 4'-0"
- Two Car Garage w/Golf Cart: 14'-0" x 49'-0"
- Garage Storage: 12'-9" x 15'-0"
- Lower Terrace: 25'-5" x 11'-0"

UNIT AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Conditioned SF</th>
<th>Unconditioned SF</th>
<th>Gross Unit Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground Level</td>
<td>162 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Level</td>
<td>1,151 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Level</td>
<td>1,151 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioned SF Total</td>
<td>2,464 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditioned SF Total (Garage &amp; Storage)</td>
<td>989 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Unit Area</td>
<td>3,453 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porches SF Total</td>
<td>746 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROOms

01 Front Porch Entrance  9’-6” x 7’-0”
02 Stair Hall  13’-5” x 10’-0”
03 Elevator  4’-6” x 4’-0”
04 Kitchen with Seated Island  14’-2” x 10’-4”
05 Dining Room  12’-0” x 15’-7”
06 Living Room  15’-6” x 14’-7”
07 Coat Closet  3’-0” x 3’-0”
08 Guest Bedroom 1  14’-3” x 12’-10”
09 Guest Bathroom 1  10’-0” x 10’-6”
10 Screen Porch  14’-5” x 11’-0”
11 Upper Terrace  10’-11” x 11’-0”

Unit Area

Ground Level  162 SF
1st Level  1,151 SF
Second Level  1,151 SF

Conditioned SF Total  2,464 SF
Unconditioned SF Total  989 SF
Garage & Storage

Gross Unit Area  3,453 SF

Porches SF Total  746 SF
FLOOR PLAN  UPPER LEVEL
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ROOMS

01  Stair Hall  13'-5" x 10'-11"
02  Elevator  4'-6" x 4'-0"
03  Sitting Room/Office  10'-3" x 9'-11"
04  Master Bedroom  14'-5" x 15'-3"
05  Master Bathroom  12'-8" x 9'-2"
06  Walk-In Wardrobe  12'-10" x 5'-6"
07  Guest Bedroom 2  14'-3" x 12'-10"
08  Guest Bathroom 2  5'-11" x 10'-4"
09  Laundry  3'-7" x 6'-3"
10  Master Terrace  14'-4" x 11'-0"

UNIT AREA

Ground Level  162 SF
First Level  1,151 SF
Second Level  1,151 SF
Conditioned SF Total  2,464 SF
Unconditioned SF Total (Garage & Storage)  989 SF
Gross Unit Area  3,453 SF
Porches SF Total  746 SF

SOUTH
ROOFS

- **01**: Shingle Roof 5:12 Pitch
- **02**: Shingle Roof 3:12 Pitch
- **03**: TPO Cricket
- **04**: Chimney
- **05**: Skylight Roof Access over Office
- **06**: Stair Skylight

---

**PLAN ROOF**
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ATTACHMENT #4

Subdivision Plat (1984)
ATTACHMENT #5

Property Photos
ATTACHMENT #6

Zoning Map
ATTACHMENT #7

Aerial Image
TM # 147-01-00-092

Note: The Charleston County makes every effort possible to produce the most accurate information. The layers contained in the map service are for information purposes only. The Charleston County makes no warranty, express or implied, nor any guaranty as to the content, sequence, accuracy, timeliness or completeness of any of the information provided. The County explicitly disclaims all representations and warranties. The reader agrees to hold harmless the Charleston County for any cause of action and costs associated with any causes of action which may arise as a consequence of the County providing this information.
ATTACHMENT #8

FEMA Base Flood Elevation
TITLE TO REAL ESTATE
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that WOOD DEVELOPMENT, INC., a South Carolina corporation (the "Grantor"), in the State aforesaid, for and in consideration of the sum of NINE HUNDRED SEVENTY FIVE THOUSAND AND 00/100 DOLLARS ($975,000.00), to it in hand paid at and before the sealing of these Presents by REYNOLDS-WILLIAMS AT MARSHWOOD, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company (the "Grantee"), in the State aforesaid, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, has granted, bargained, sold and released, and by these Presents does grant, bargain, sell and release unto the said REYNOLDS-WILLIAMS AT MARSHWOOD, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company, the following described property, to-wit:

SEE EXHIBIT “A” ATTACHED HERETO
AND INCORPORATED HEREIN BY REFERENCE FOR A FULL AND COMPLETE LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY BEING CONVEYED (THE “PROPERTY” OR “PREMISES”)

Address of Grantee:

3800 Seabrook Island Road
Seabrook island, SC 29455

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 Grantee, its successors and assigns, forever.

AND subject to the exceptions set forth above, the Grantor does hereby bind itself and its successors and assigns, to warrant and forever defend, all and singular, the premises before mentioned unto the said Grantee, its successors and assigns, against itself and its successors, and all persons whomsoever lawfully claiming, or to claim the same or any part thereof.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, WOOD DEVELOPMENT, INC., a South Carolina corporation has caused these presents to be executed in its name by Heather S. Wood, its President, this 15th day of September, in the year of our Lord Two Thousand Nine and in the Two Hundred and Thirty-Fourth year of the Sovereignty and Independence of the United States of America.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED
IN THE PRESENCE OF:

[Signature]
Witness #1

[Signature]
Witness #2/Notary

WOOD DEVELOPMENT, INC.
a South Carolina corporation

By: Heather S. Wood
Its: President

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me by WOOD DEVELOPMENT, INC., by Heather S. Wood, its President, this 15th day of September, 2009.

[Signature]
Notary Public for South Carolina
My commission expires: 11/1/208

{00150104.DOC}
EXHIBIT A

All that piece, parcel or trace of land, situate, lying and being on Seabrook Island, in Charleston County, South Carolina, and shown as a parcel containing 1.81 acres on a plat dated August 4, 1983 by E.M. Seabrook, Jr., CE & LS, recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Plat Book AY at Page 67, and further shown on a plat dated May 28, 1984 with latest revision July 18, 1984 by Gifford, Nielson, Williams, LS, recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Plat Book BA at Page 169, which plat is expressly incorporated herein by specific reference thereto.

SAID parcel of land having the buttins, boundings, measurements, dimensions, courses, and distances as will more fully be shown by reference to said plat.

ALSO

The Grantor's right, title and interest, if any, in and to the following described property:

ALL that piece, parcel or tract of land, situate, lying and being on Seabrook Island, in Charleston County, South Carolina, and being the marsh land which lies generally to the East and North of and being contiguous and adjacent to the property above described.

The marsh land herein described is bounded generally on the South and West by the eastern and northern property lines of the 1.23 acres and 1.81 acres tracts of land described above; and on the North by the eastern extension of the property line marked N78 47' 43"E to the center of a creek; and on the East by the meanderings of the center line of said creek; and thence in a southerly direction following the center line of the 45' drainage easement which affects the Southeastern portion of the 1.81 acres tract described above to a point marking the southeast corner of said 1.81 acres located on the easement center line (abandoned property line) on the plat mentioned below.

The marsh land herein described is partially shown on the Plat of E.M. Seabrook, Jr., CE & LS dated August 4, 1983 and recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Plat Book AY at Page 67 and further shown on a plat dated May 28, 1984 with latest revision July 18, 1984 by Gifford, Nielson, Williams, LS, recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Plat Book BA at Page 169.

PLUS

A non-exclusive easement appurtenant for ingress, egress and utilities, to and from the property described as 1.81 acres, more or less; and shown on the plat of E.M. Seabrook, Jr., CE & LS dated August 4, 1983 and recorded in Plat Book AY at Page 67, Charleston County RMC Office, and further shown on a plat dated May 28, 1984 with latest revision July 18, 1984 by Gifford, Nielson, Williams, LS, recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Plat Book BA at Page 169 over, across and under the 60' right of way shown as "Marsh Walk Trace" on the plat dated August 4, 1983, by E.M. Seabrook, Jr., CE and LS recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Plat
Book AY at Page 67. Said 60' right of way has the buttins, boundings, measurements, dimensions, courses and distances as will more fully be shown by reference to said plat.

This being the same property conveyed to Wood Development, Inc. by deed of conveyance from CN Properties, L.L.C. dated March 15, 2007 and recorded March 21, 2007 in Book F619, Page 31 in the RMC Office for Charleston County, South Carolina.

TMS Number: 149-01-00-092

SUBJECT TO the matters set forth on Exhibit “B” attached hereto.

EXHIBIT “B”

1. Right-of-Way Easement in favor of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company dated May 17, 1984 and recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Book H-139 at Page 137.

2. Protective Covenants for Multi-Family Residential Areas of Seabrook island dated April 22, 1974 and recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Book M-105 at Page 194, as modified in Book Y-110 at Page 145.

3. Re-stated and Amended ByLaws of Seabrook Island Property Owners Association recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Book S-109 at page 2, as amended by instrument recorded in the aforesaid RMC Office in Book H-137 at Page 163.

4. Any portion of the premises which lies below the mean high water mark of abutting tidal streams.

5. Forty-five (45’) foot drainage easement as shown on Plat by E.M. Seabrook, Jr., CE & LS, dated August 4, 1983 and recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Plat Book AY at Page 67.

6. Non-exclusive easement for ingress, egress, and utilities, to and from the property insured hereunder, over, across, and under the sixty (60’) foot right-of-way shown as Marshwalk Tract on Plat by E.M. Seabrook, Jr., CE & LS, dated August 4, 1983 and recorded in the RMC Office for Charleston County in Plat Book AY at Page 67.

7. Interests created by, or limitations on use imposed by, the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act or other federal law or by SC Code, Chapter 39, Title 48, as amended, or any regulations promulgated pursuant to said state or federal laws.
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 0 Marshwalk Trace, Seabrook Island bearing Charleston County bearing Tax Map Number 149-01-00-092, was transferred by Wood Development, Inc., a South Carolina corporation to Reynolds-Williams at Marshwood, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company on September 15, 2009.

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 $975,000.00
   (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. 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: 975,000.00
   (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: 975,000.00

7. The deed recording fee due is based on the amount listed on Line 6(c) above and the deed recording fee due is: $5,607.50

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.

______________________________
Legal Representative
Amanda L. Calladner

Sworn to before me this 15th day of September, 2009.
______________________________
Notary Public for South Carolina
My Commission Expires: 07/11/15
**RECORDED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>September 16, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3:39:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>0081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DocType</td>
<td>Deed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charlie Lybrand, Register
Charleston County, SC

# of Pages: 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recording Fee</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fee</td>
<td>$2,535.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Fee</td>
<td>$1,072.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Pages</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,618.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PEGGY A. MOSELEY
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Property Information

Current Owner:
REYNOLDS-WILLIAMS AT MARSHWOOD LLC
3047 HIGH HAMMOCK RD
SEABROOK ISLAND SC 29455

Property ID
1490100092

Physical Address
MARSHWALK ACE TR

Property Class
952 - VAC-COMM-LOT

Plat Book/Page
/

Neighborhood
111474 AD74 MISC COMMERCIAL AREA

Deed Acres
1.8100

Legal Description
Subdivision Name -PART SEABROOK ISLAND
PlatSuffix BA-169 PoITwp 009

Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Grantor</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Deed</th>
<th>Deed Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0081</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>9/15/2009</td>
<td>WOOD DEVELOPMENT INC</td>
<td>REYNOLDS-WILLIAMS AT</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F619</td>
<td>031</td>
<td>3/15/2007</td>
<td>CN PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>WOOD DEVELOPMENT INC</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S309</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>8/27/1998</td>
<td>ABU SHAWREB HASSAN</td>
<td>CN PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V233</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>10/12/1993</td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA NATIONAL BANK THE</td>
<td>ABU SHAWREB HASSAN</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J194</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>6/6/1990</td>
<td>MARSH WALK ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA NATIONAL BANK THE</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N133</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10/31/1983</td>
<td>MARSH WALK ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>MARSH WALK ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PIN: 1490100092

This data is as-of 07-07-2021

The information on this page is for Tax Year 2021 and reflects the status of the property for that tax year. This includes building information, values and information on exemptions, discounts and special assessments. Any changes for Tax Year 2022 will not be displayed until later in 2022.

Value Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Residence</th>
<th>LR Pct</th>
<th>AgUse</th>
<th>ATI 25Pct Exemption</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>$1,024,959</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,024,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capped Value *</td>
<td>$1,024,959</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,024,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable/Use Value **</td>
<td>$1,024,959</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,024,959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>$1,024,959</td>
<td>$946,116</td>
<td>$946,116</td>
<td>$946,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capped Value *</td>
<td>$1,024,959</td>
<td>$946,116</td>
<td>$946,116</td>
<td>$946,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable/Use Value **</td>
<td>$1,024,959</td>
<td>$946,116</td>
<td>$946,116</td>
<td>$946,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
<td>$56,770</td>
<td>$56,770</td>
<td>$56,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Capped Value: At County-wide reassessments the increase in the value of a property for tax purposes is limited (capped) at no more than 15%.

** Taxable/Use Value: The Capped Value and Taxable/Use Value are usually the same. If the property has been approved for Agricultural Use the values will be different.

Dwelling Info

No data available

Additional Improvements

No data available

https://www.charlestoncounty.org/assessorsearch.php?s=1490100092
Sketches

No sketches available

Municipalities

City of Charleston
City of Folly Beach
City of North Charleston
City of Isle of Palms
Town of Awendaw
Town of Hollywood
Town of James Island
Town of Kiawah Island
Town of McClellanville
Town of Meggett
Town of Mount Pleasant
Town of Ravenel
Town of Rockville
Town of Seabrook Island
Town of Sullivan's Island

Visitor Information

Additional Resources

Arts & Entertainment
CARTA Transit System
County Library
County Parks
Transportation Sales Tax
School District
Charleston Community Guide
Sex Offenders Search
Identity Theft Info
Traffic Cam
Make-A-Wish Car Donation
United Way 24hr hotline

Social Media

Site Translation
PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE:
Letter to Neighboring Property Owners
TO: Neighboring Property Owners
FROM: Joseph M. Cronin, Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator
SUBJECT: Variance Request for Tax Map # 149-01-00-092 (Variance #175)
DATE: June 29, 2021

Dear Property Owner:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the owners of CHARLESTON COUNTY TAX MAP # 149-01-00-092 (located on Long Bend Road adjacent to Marsh Walk Villas and the Seabrook Island Racquet Club) have requested a VARIANCE from the zoning requirements of the Town’s Development Standards Ordinance (DSO). The purpose of the variance request is to:

- REDUCE THE MARSH SETBACK FROM 25 FEET TO 10 FEET (15-FOOT ENCROACHMENT) TO ALLOW FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A DRIVEWAY AND VEHICULAR PARKING AREA;
- REDUCE THE MARSH SETBACK FROM 25 FEET TO APPROXIMATELY 18 FEET (7-FOOT ENCROACHMENT) TO ALLOW FOR CONSTRUCTION OF AN ATTACHED MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCE (“UNIT 8”);
- REDUCE THE MARSH SETBACK FOR OPEN DECKS FROM 15 FEET TO 7 FEET (8-FOOT ENCROACHMENT) TO ALLOW FOR THE ENCROACHMENT OF AN OPEN DECK (“UNIT 8”); AND
- ELIMINATE THE REQUIRED 50-FOOT LANDSCAPED BUFFER ALONG THE SHARED PROPERTY LINE WITH TM # 149-01-00-093 (SEABROOK ISLAND RACQUET CLUB/TENNIS COURTS).

A copy of the variance application is enclosed for your information.

The Seabrook Island Board of Zoning Appeals will hold a VIRTUAL PUBLIC HEARING on the variance request at the date and time listed below. This notification is being provided to you pursuant to Section § 20.70.40 of the DSO.

PUBLIC HEARING DATE: FRI. JULY 30, 2021
PUBLIC HEARING TIME: 2:30 PM
PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION: VIRTUAL MEETING VIA ZOOM

For information on how to submit a public comment during (or prior to) the Virtual Public Hearing, please refer to the attached Public Hearing Notice.

The Virtual Public Hearing will be live streamed on the town’s YouTube channel beginning at 2:30 PM at the following address:

LIVE STREAM: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCIkF87knEApHD1g0kGlaGZg.

If you have any questions about the contents of this letter, please feel free to contact me by phone at (843) 768-9121 or by email at jcronin@townofseabrookisland.org.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joseph M. Cronin
Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator
Good morning,

About two weeks ago, we mailed out written notice to neighboring property owners and regimes about a pending variance request for property located on Long Bend Drive, adjacent to the Seabrook Island Racquet Club and Marsh Walk Villas. Because most of these letters were sent to management companies, I wanted to follow up with an email to the President or Chair of each regime to make sure that you had received a copy of this notice. The attached PDF document contains a copy of the public hearing notice, the applicant’s variance application packet, and instructions for individuals who wish to provide a public comment in support of or in opposition to the request. (This is the same information that was previously mailed out.) If you have not already done so, you are welcome to share this information with residents and property owners within your regime. Thanks.

Joseph M. Cronin
Town Administrator
Town of Seabrook Island
2001 Seabrook Island Road
Seabrook Island, SC 29455
Office: (843) 768-5321
www.townofseabrookisland.org
ATTACHMENT #12

Public Hearing Notice:
List of Neighboring Property Owners
# VARIANCE NOTIFICATION LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY ADDRESS</th>
<th>OWNER(S) OF RECORD</th>
<th>STREET ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY, STATE &amp; ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HORSESHOE COVE</td>
<td>HORSESHOE COVE TOWN HOME ASSOCIATES INC.</td>
<td>3714 BETSY KERRISON PKWY, SUITE 1</td>
<td>JOHNS ISLAND, SC 29455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERON POINT VILLAS</td>
<td>HERON POINT VILLAS COUNCIL OF CO-OWNERS</td>
<td>1703 ASHLEY RIVER ROAD</td>
<td>CHARLESTON, SC 29407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDDLERS COVE</td>
<td>FIDDLERS COVE OWNERS ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>3714 BETSY KERRISON PKWY, SUITE 1</td>
<td>JOHNS ISLAND, SC 29455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDDLERS COVE II</td>
<td>FIDDLERS COVE II TOWNHOUSE OWNERS ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>3714 BETSY KERRISON PKWY, SUITE 1</td>
<td>JOHNS ISLAND, SC 29455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTER COURT</td>
<td>COURTSIDE VILLAS II COUNCIL OF CO-OWNERS</td>
<td>5 WARREN STREET</td>
<td>CHARLESTON, SC 29403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACQUET CLUB VILLAS</td>
<td>RACQUET CLUB VILLAS AT SEABROOK HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIME INC.</td>
<td>960 MORRISON DRIVE, SUITE 100</td>
<td>CHARLESTON, SC 29403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSH WALK VILLAS</td>
<td>MARSH WALK COUNCIL OF CO-OWNERS INC</td>
<td>960 MORRISON DRIVE, SUITE 100</td>
<td>CHARLESTON, SC 29403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALT MARSH</td>
<td>SALT MARSH AT SEABROOK CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION INC</td>
<td>1845 SAINT JULIAN PLACE</td>
<td>COLUMBIA, SC 29204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC RACQUET CLUB</td>
<td>THE CLUB AT SEABROOK ISLAND INC.</td>
<td>3772 SEABROOK ISLAND ROAD</td>
<td>SEABROOK ISLAND, SC 29455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSH</td>
<td>MARSHLAND TRUST INC.</td>
<td>3657 ROBIAH Hill RD</td>
<td>MORAVIA, NY 13118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPOA</td>
<td>SEABROOK ISLAND PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>1202 LANDFALL WAY</td>
<td>SEABROOK ISLAND, SC 29455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Hearing Notice:
USPS Certified Mail Receipts
Public Hearing Notice:
Post & Courier Legal Ad
AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

The Post and Courier

State of South Carolina
County of Charleston

I, 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

appeared in the issues of said newspaper on the following day(s):
06/30/21 Wed PC
06/30/21 Wed CNW

at a cost of $251.52
Account# 108294
Order# 1947512
P.O. Number:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of June, 2021

[Signature]

NOTARY PUBLIC, SC
My commission expires 09/24/2023

SOUTH CAROLINA
Public Hearing Notice:
Property Posting
Items Related to Previous Development Plans (2007-08)
Town of Seabrook Island - Zoning Permit

Permit Date: 1/23/2007  
Paid Date: 1/23/2007  
Applicant Name: Wood Development, Inc.  
Contact Name: Heather Wood  
App Address1: 2527 Royal Oak Drive  
App Address2:  
App City: Johns Island  
St: SC  
Zip: 29455  

Property Owner: C.N. Properties  
Owner Address1: 4 David Joseph Road  
Owner Address2:  
Owner City: Hopkinton  
St: MA  
Zip: 01748  

TMS Number: 149-01-00-092  
Property Address: Marshwalk Trace  

Purpose: Planning Commission Review of 11 Multi-Family Units  

Work Value: $4,000,000.  
Flood Elev: 14  
Zone: AE  

Architectural Review Board:  
Comments: Planning Commission Review of Multi-Family 11 Units  

Amendment:  

This Zoning Permit is valid for six (6) months. The action for which this permit was obtained must be taken within that time period.

If this zoning permit is for issuance of a building permit, such building permit is valid for a period of one (1) year as described in the town code. Any extensions, alterations, or amendments must be approved in writing by the Town of Seabrook Island Zoning Administration.

I hereby certify that the above information and any plan or drawing submitted herewith are true and accurate indications of existing or proposed improvements to the above identified property.

Owner/Applicant's Signature  
1/23/2007  

Zoning Administrator  
1/23/2007
CURRENT OWNER1: 
CURRENT OWNER2: 
SALE DATE: 8/27/1998 
DEED BOOK: S309-525 
WILL CODE: 
WILL DATE: 
C O NAME: 
MAIL STREET NUMBER: 4 
MAIL STREET NAME: DAVID JOSEPH RD 
MAIL UNIT: 
MAIL CITY: HOPKINTON 
MAIL STATE: MA 
MAIL ZIP: 01748-2016 
MAIL COUNTRY: 
MAIL POSTAL CODE: 
SALE PRICE: 160000 
MULT LOT: 
SPLIT CODE: 
MLOD GROUP: 
FINAL VALUE: 861000 
BUILD COUNT: 0 
AG USE VAL: 
AG MARKET TOT: 
LR APPROVE: N 
YEAR BUILT: 
BEDROOMS: 
FULL BATHS: 
THREE QTR BATHS: 
HALF BATHS: 
TOTAL FINISH AREA: 
LIVING AREA: 
CONDO-BEDROOM: 
CONDO FULL BATH: 
CONDO H-BATH: 
CONDO YR BUILT: 

Wood Development, Inc.
2527 Royal Oak Drive
Johns Island, SC 29455
843-559-5513

RE: Marshwalk Trace/ Longbend Drive Property
TMS: 149-01-00-092
1.8 acre Tract

To Whom It May Concern:

The owners of the Marshwalk Trace tract of land off Longbend Drive, CN Properties, have a contract with Wood Development, Inc. to sell the parcel of land for a multi-family development. CN Properties has authorized Wood Development, Inc to submit a preliminary proposal to the Town of Seabrook for approval.

Sincerely,

Heather Wood
President, Wood Development, Inc.
January 22, 2007

Preliminary site Plan Submission:
Marshwood at Seabrook

RE: Marshwalk Trace/Longbend Drive
TMS: 149-01-00-092
1.8 Acre Tract

-Developer: Wood Development, Inc.; contact –Heather Wood 843-559-5513
-Zoned Multi-Family, 7 units per acre: Total Proposed Units- 11 (3 bedroom, 3 bath)

-Total lot coverage: 39.89%
-Total Parking spaces: 35 (2 HCP)
-Building Height 36’ Maximum Above Base Flood
-Critical Line established on September 22, 2006, 25’ Setback
-Building Setback from Long Bend Drive: 179’
-Traffic Impact Analysis: NA
-Driveways/Roadways: Minimum of 16’ wide
-Minimum Setback from similar development buildings: Minimum 15’
-Several groups of Live Oaks along the Marsh edge of Tract ranging in size up to 26’
-The interior of the Tract contains mostly Pine Trees and Wax Myrtles.
-Pond, and 45’ drainage easement are located on the tract to aid in drainage.
Timeline summary for development of Marshwood Villas:

January-February, 2007- Preliminary submission of proposed plans for Marshwood Villas

March 15, 2007- Closing on Property

March-April, 2007- Final Approval of plans from Town of Seabrook Island and the Property Owners Association

April-June, 2007- Complete final drawings of construction plans, including; Blueprints and all necessary engineering.

June-September, 2007- Apply for all permits.

September-December, 2007- Begin site prep and construction. Start foundation work on Building 3, roll to Building 2, then to Building 4 and finally Building 1. Construction will continue in that order with subcontractors.

February 8, 2007

Ms. Heather J. Wood
Wood Development Inc.
2527 Royal Oak Drive
Johns Island, SC 29455

Dear Ms. Wood:

Commission Chairman Joe Hall told me he had talked to you following the Town Zoning work session about your planned Marshwood at Seabrook project. He asked me to mail you the attached draft of a developer agreement for water and sewer services that will be necessary for your project. Except for name, address, and project, this is the basic agreement the Commission has used for all projects built in its service area over the past decade.

Also attached is a copy of the Commission’s standards and procedures that must be followed in fulfilling the design and construction items covered in the developer agreement. Your architect/engineer and contractor should be given copies of this.

If, after you have looked over the draft, you have corrections or questions or would like execution copies of the agreement made up, please get in touch with me at our Operations office (phone/address below).

The Commission looks forward to working with you to make your project a success.

Sincerely,

Tommy West
Operations Manager
SEABROOK ISLAND UTILITY COMMISSION (SIUC)
Water & Wastewater Development Procedures

Pre-Construction

The Developer shall:

- Submit all final plans and specifications for the SIUC functional and conceptual review and approval prior to submission to the SC Department of Health & Environmental Control (DHEC) for their approval. The plans and specifications shall be prepared by the Developers engineer in accordance with DHEC requirements described in “Standards for Wastewater Facility Construction: R.61-67.
- Approval of plans by the SIUC and its engineer are in concept only. The developer is still responsible for any conflicts in the approved plans
- Submit to the SIUC a copy of all easements to be granted to the SIUC.
- Submit to the DHEC a copy of the SIUC approved plans and specs.
- Submit to SIUC a copy of the DHEC Permit to Construct prior to starting construction.
- No construction shall be performed without a Notice to Proceed from SIUC and its engineer.

During Construction

The Developer shall:

- Allow inspection by the SIUC or its engineering inspector.
- Submit a certification letter from the Developer’s representative that the contractor is ready for the SIUC or its inspector to witness the testing of the constructed facilities.
- Test the facilities shall be made in the presence of SIUC or its engineering inspector. SIUC will notify the Developers representative of the testing procedures to be used for the specific project.

Final Approval Prior to SIUC Submittal of Acceptance Letter to DHEC for a Permit to Operate

SIUC will accept the project when the following items have been completed and submitted by the Developer to SIUC:
• Programming of SIUC radio telemetry system if new radio telemetry equipment is required in the installation.
• Provide factory start-up of mechanical equipment in the presence of SIUC personnel.
• Provide three (3) copies of all equipment operations and maintenance manuals.
• Complete as-built drawings (22” x34”) that consist of a title block on each page that includes revision date and a description of the revision. The as-built drawings shall consist of two (2) paper sets, one (1) Mylar set and one (1) copy of the electronic computer drawing file shall be submitted to the SIUC for the entire project that includes the final location and elevation of any of the following items:
  - Pump station(s)
  - Valves
  - Hydrants
  - Water, wastewater and storm water pipes (gravity and pressurized)
  - Meter boxes
  - Manhole top casting
  - Manhole inverts
  - Sewer cleanouts
  - Service stubs from the main lines
  - Property boundaries
  - Changes in grade and distance changes measured from reference points
  - Existing or proposed streets on or abutting the developed tract including names and right of way widths
  - Location and names of all streams, lakes, marshes and other watercourses on or adjacent to the property
  - Each page shall be signed and sealed by a land surveyor registered in the State of South Carolina
• One (1) electronic computer drawing file and two (2) paper sets of GIS locations and elevations of any of the following items installed in the final project:
  - Pump stations
  - Valves
  - Hydrants
  - Meter boxes
  - Manhole top casting
  - Manhole inverts
  - Sewer cleanouts
  - Service stubs from the main lines
• A copy of all recorded easements and title to plats to be provided to the SIUC.
• A punch list of items to be corrected by the Developer will be prepared by the SIUC and its engineering inspector and submitted to the Developers engineer.
• The Developer shall make punch list corrections.
• The Developer shall reimburse the SIUC for all invoices for engineering inspection.
• The Developer shall deliver to SIUC a written certification, prepared and signed by the Developer’s registered engineer, detailing and summarizing the Developer’s costs, including engineering fees, for all materials and vendors of the the water distribution portion of the project.
• The Developer shall deliver to SIUC a written certification, prepared and signed by the Developer’s **registered engineer**, detailing and summarizing the Developer’s costs, including engineering fees, for all materials and vendors of the sewer collection portion of the project.

• The Developer shall secure a certification from his contractor that all equipment, materials and workmanship in the water distribution and sewer collection systems are warranted for one year from the date of receipt of a DEHC Permit to Operate. The Developer shall take all actions necessary to represent that this certification and all manufacturer’s warranties for equipment and materials in the water distribution and sewer collection are properly assignable, with their assignment being made to Town at closing.

• Compliance with any items within the written agreement between the Developer and the SIUC.

TAC 2/11/04
Fax

To: SIUC
Joe Hall or Tommy West

From: Heather Wood
Wood Development, Inc.

Re: Proposed Marshwood Villa
SIUC Agreement

Here is the signed agreement for your files, I will mail or drop off an original. Thank you for helping make this project a success! My Engineers at Trico will be contacting you with questions concerning the site. If you have any questions for me please call me at 559-5513 or 345-5272.

Thanks again,
Heather
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

) ) AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT made this 5th day of MARCH, 2007 by and between Wood Development, Inc., whose mailing address is 2527 Royal Oak Drive, Johns Island, South Carolina 29455, hereinafter referred to as “Developer”, and the Seabrook Island Utility Commission, a component unit of the Town of Seabrook Island, whose address is 2001 Seabrook Island Road, John’s Island, South Carolina 29455, hereinafter referred to as “Town”.

WITNESSETH

THAT WHEREAS, Developer is the owner of certain lands within the Town of Seabrook Island, Charleston County, South Carolina and shown on that certain map, attached hereto, entitled Marshwood at Seabrook, comprised of 4 buildings containing 11 residential units located on approximately 1.88 acres at the end of Long Bend Drive, hereinafter known as “Subdivision”, and

WHEREAS, Developer is desirous of installing water supply and sewer collection systems to provide water and sewer service to all persons now or hereafter owning residential units in the Subdivision and requiring such water and sewer service, and

WHEREAS, Developer has requested Town to own and operate said water distribution and sewer collection systems as an extension of its existing water distribution system and sewer collection system and treatment facility, and

WHEREAS, Town is agreeable to owning and operating the completed water distribution and sewer collection systems as an extension of its existing water distribution system and sewer collection system and treatment facility, and

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the premises and of the rights, powers and duties hereinafter set forth to be performed by each, Developer and Town mutually do agree as follows:

1. As soon as practicable after execution of this contract and the delivery to the Town of fifteen (15) copies of a map of Salt Marsh Development, Town shall record an extension of Town’s franchised service territory to serve the Subdivision. [marshwood]

2. (a) Developer will cause to be installed a water distribution system and a sewer collection system to serve the Subdivision in accordance with plans and specifications drawn by Developer’s engineer and to be approved in writing by Town and the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control,
hereinafter referred to as DHEC. It shall be the responsibility of Developer through Developer’s engineer to obtain DHEC approval and all other approvals required by governmental authorities.

(b) The water distribution system for the Subdivision, installed by Developer at Developer’s cost, shall, in addition to mains, include the connection to Town’s existing water distribution system and individual residential unit service lines, terminating with control valves specified by Town, to which each residential unit water line will be connected for water service. Developer may install one or more service lines with appropriate control valves to be used for landscape irrigation as a part of the water distribution system. Actual service from such service lines, in the near term or later, will be subject to the same Impact and Connection Fees as individual service to a residential unit.

(c) The sewer collection system for the Subdivision, installed by Developer at Developer’s cost, shall include, if necessary, lift stations with radio telemetry compatible with Town’s existing system, force mains and/or mains, the connection to Town’s existing collection system, any necessary modifications to Town’s existing lift stations, force mains or mains used to transport the sewage from Subdivision to Town’s wastewater treatment plant and individual service lines to each residential unit, terminating with control valves specified by Town, to which each residential unit sewer line will be connected for sewer service.

(d) Developer’s engineer shall inspect the actual construction of the water distribution and sewer collection systems and certify the completion in writing to DHEC. Town or its engineering inspector shall have the right to inspect such construction at any time during its progress.

(e) Should Developer in Developer’s sole discretion choose not to develop the residential units, then Developer shall not be obligated to install the water distribution and sewer collection system to serve the Subdivision.

3. (a) Developer agrees to convey to Town upon completion, by Bill of Sale, the water distribution and sewer collection systems installed in accordance with the plans approved by DHEC and Town, including mains, service lines, valves, manholes and all other equipment necessary and proper to serve water and sewer connections in the Subdivision.

(b) If any water and/or sewer mains, valves, service lines or equipment are not within publicly dedicated rights of way, then Developer shall convey to Town, at no cost to Town, a perpetual easement ten (10) feet on each side of the water and/or sewer main, valve, service or equipment, which easement shall be for ingress, egress, regress and access and to construct, operate, maintain, repair and replace the sewer and appurtenant equipment.

4. The closing shall take place after the water distribution and sewer collection
systems has been completed, inspected and certified by Developer’s engineer, final inspection and approved for operation by DHEC, and inspected and approved by the Town. At closing Developer shall deliver to Town the following:

i. Bill of Sale of completed water distribution and sewer collection systems (para. 3.a.)

ii. Written perpetual easements for the water distribution and sewer collection systems (para. 3.b.)

iii. Written certification of Developer’s cost (para. 7.)

iv. Warranties for components of the water distribution and sewer collection systems (para. 9.)

5. When the closing is fully completed Town will provide water and sewer services to the residents of the Development under terms of this agreement, under terms of the Town Schedule of Rates and Charges, under terms required by DHEC, in full compliance with the laws of the State of South Carolina and with the rules and regulations of DHEC and other applicable governmental bodies.

6. Before water and sewer service is commenced for any residential unit in each of the 4 buildings comprising the Subdivision, the following must have occurred: Developer shall have paid the applicable water and sewer Impact and Connection Fees for the total number of residential units within that specific building. Such Impact Fee and Connection Fees shall be those in effect in the Seabrook Island Utility Commission’s “Schedule of Rates and Conditions for Water and Sewer Service” at the time each fee is made. The Impact Fee and Connection Fee per residential unit, served by a less than one inch water meter, in effect on the date of this agreement is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Impact Fee</th>
<th>Connection Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Developer, at the closing, shall deliver to Town a written certification of the Developer’s cost in the water distribution and the sewer collection systems, including engineering fees for the systems, which shall have a breakdown between the various components showing the vendors and appropriate amounts.

8. Town must approve, in writing, prior to the commencement of any work, all contractors and subcontractors who will perform work on the installation of the water distribution and sewer collection systems and all other water and sewer system construction in the Subdivision.
9. Developer shall secure a certification from his contractor that all equipment, materials and workmanship in the water distribution and sewer collection systems are warranted for one year from the date of receipt of a DEHC Permit to Operate. Developer shall take all actions necessary to represent that this certification and all manufacturer’s warranties for equipment and materials in the water distribution and sewer collection are properly assignable, with their assignment being made to Town at closing.

10. Town’s “Water and Wastewater Development Procedures”, attached hereto and made a part hereof, gives detailed specifics of Pre-Construction/During Construction/Final Approval items which must be completed as a part of Town’s acceptance of ownership, operation and maintenance of Developer installed water distribution and sewer collection systems that become extensions of the Town’s existing water and sewer system.

11. Developer agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the Town against any and all actions or claims relating to injuries and/or damages to any person or property caused by or resulting from the construction and design of the water distribution and sewer systems subject to this agreement. Developer is not indemnifying the Town against its own act of negligence.

12. The federal taxpayer ID number of the Developer is as follows: 57-101-2822.

The federal taxpayer ID number of the Town is as follows: 57-0855224.

13. This agreement shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of Developer and Town and the successors and assigns of each.

14. This writing embodies the entire agreement and understanding between the parties hereto and there are no other agreements or understandings, oral or written with reference to the subject matter hereof that are not merged herein and superseded hereby.

15. This agreement shall not be modified, amended, or changed in any respect except in writing, duly signed by the parties hereto, and each party hereby waives any right to amend this agreement in any way.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Developer and Town have caused this instrument to be executed by the President, attested by the Secretary or Assistant Secretary, with corporate seal as appropriate affixed hereunto by authority of their Board of Directors the day and year first above written. The Chairman of the Commission shall execute this agreement on behalf of the Seabrook Island Utility Commission and the Clerk of the Commission, who will supply minutes of a Commission meeting authorizing the execution, will attest it to.
Wood Development, Inc.

Heather Wood

Heather Wood - President

(signature & typed/printed name, position)

Seabrook Island Utility Commission

Joseph W. Hall, Chairman

Commission Clerk
February 11, 2007

Seabrook Island Realty
1003 Landfall Way
Johns Island, SC 29455

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to inform the Salt Marsh Villas of a Multi-family plan submitted with the Town of Seabrook Island. The property, located adjacent to Marshwalk Villas and across the marsh from the Racket Club, is currently zoned for Multi-family (TMS: 149-01-00-092). The parcel could potentially allow for up to 14 units, but only 11 units are proposed. All units will be townhouse style and are three bedrooms with three baths. The design and site plans have been planned to blend well with the existing complexes. A private entrance from Longbend Drive will allow for minimal impact on area villas during and after construction. This is an informational, courtesy memo, because no rezoning or variances are necessary, the town is not required to send out a public notice to nearby regimes.

Please contact Heather Wood with Wood Property Management, LLC at 345-5272 or 559-5513 if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Heather Wood
Wood Property Management, LLC
February 27, 2007

Town of Seabrook Island  
Randy Pierce  
2001 Seabrook Island Road  
Seabrook Island, SC 29455  

Dear Randy,

This letter is to inform the Town of Seabrook that I have in my files a copy of the proposed site plan for the Marshwood Villa, multi family project. After looking at the site plan and determining the ingress and egress points of the property, including the width of the road, I have determined that our fire trucks will have adequate access to the Villas. St. John's Fire Department reserves the right to review any changes or additions to the plan to ensure access to the property is not impeded.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chief Smith  
St. John's Fire Department
Form Confirmation

Thank you for submitting the following information:

Contact Name: Heather Wood

Organization Name: Wood Development, INC

Phone# or Email Address: hntwood@aol.com

Fax# or Mailing Address: 843 559 3680

Tax Map#: 149 01 00 092

Area of County: Seabrook Island, SC

Subdivision Name:

Subdivision Application #:

Location Description: Seabrook Island, 1.8 acres multi-family

Number of Streets Needed: 2

Proposed Street Names:

Brookewood Lane
Tannerwood Lane
Driftwood Lane
Lynnwood Lane
Woodhaven
Broadwood
Riverwood
Baywood
Harborwood
Oakwood
Woodhaven
Woodshire
Woodsound
Mrs. Wood,

Just letting you know that I got your reserved names you should see a memo some time early next week with the approved names. I have spoke with Randy about getting you addresses and what not so things should be moving along. I am having Randy send me a hard copy of the site plan because the file you sent me pulled up in my system but did not look to be very helpful to me with figuring out if you may need two names or not. If you need anything else please contact me at the numbers below.

Thanks

Toni Saben
Planning Technician
202-7249
tsaben@charlestoncounty.org
John Wells

From: John Wells [JWells@sipoa.org]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 7:36 AM
To: Randy Pierce
Subject: Marshwood At Seabrook Island

Randy, Sorry I missed you by telephone yesterday. Heather Wood stopped by and asked me to look at the proposed site plan for Marshwood with respect to the arrangements for garbage pickup. The plan is satisfactory as it shows a centralized garbage area which will hold 14-15 90 gallon cans. The recycle containers would be issued to each homeowner and they will be required to set the containers out where they can be visible from the road.

Sincerely,
John

John B. Wells, Director
Maintenance and Operations
(843) 768-0061 jwells@sipoa.org

3/2/07  FAX 559-3680
Heather, I sent this to Randy this morning.

It's always good to see you and Tom

John Wells

3/2/2007  20:48  SEABROOK ISLAND FUA
3/7/2007

To: Randy Pierce
   Town of Seabrook Island

From: Joe Salvo
       Executive Director, Seabrook Island Club

Re: Heather Wood

Dear Randy,

We have reviewed the plans for 11 Villas to be built as part of the Marshwalk Villa
complex on the land adjacent to the Club’s Tennis facility and have no objections to the
plans as drawn, including the 25 foot buffer zone adjacent to the tennis courts.

This is based on the understanding that no adjustments to the Club’s property, including
the tennis court size or location are required.

Joe Salvo
Executive Director
Seabrook Island Club
Dear Heather,

Per our conversation, I feel comfortable after viewing your plans that we will be able to service Marsh Walk Trace with no problems. We can service them with curbside service or via a centralized unit. We look forward to servicing your project upon its completion. If there is anything else we can do for you please let me know.

Sincerely,

Clint Odom
March 16, 2007

Heather Wood

Re: Marshwood At Seabrook Island

Ms. Wood,

This is in response to your request to make changes to the proposed Marshwood At Seabrook Island plans.

Upon review, St. Johns Fire Inspections Division agrees to the following changes as proposed:

1. Increasing the travel width of the asphalt drive from 18 feet to 20 feet from Long Bend Drive throughout the access to the Villas.

2. The closing of the existing asphalt access at Marsh Walk Trace in the area of Building #4 of Marshwood. This is contingent on proposed change #3.

3. Clear unobstructed access must be provided to the exiting hydrant located at Marsh Walk Trace as it relates to coverage and protection in the area of Building #4 of Marshwood Villas.

Please feel free contact me at 843-559-9194 should you have additional questions or concerns.

Respectfully,

Clifford J. Smith Sr.
Chief Fire Investigator
St. Johns Fire / Rescue
Town of Seabrook Island
Planning Commission Meeting

January 9, 2008

Minutes

Members Present:
John Hoover-Chairman
Cynthia Cornwell-Vice Chairman
John Scofield
Tom Sivert
Donald Smith
Randy M. Pierce-Zoning Administrator
Lynda Whitworth-Secretary

Guests Attending:
Mayor Frank McNulty
Town Councilman William Holtz
James Hayes-Glick/Boehm & Assoc.
Ed Williams-Williams & Associates
Seabrook Island Club Board Members

Chairman John Hoover called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order January 8, 2008 at 2:30 p.m. Requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were fulfilled and properly posted.

Election of Officers
John R. Hoover was nominated as 2008 Chairman of the Planning Commission and Cynthia Cornwell nominated as Vice-Chairman. Commissioner Don Smith moved to approve the nominations. Commissioner John Scofield seconded the motion. The motion to approve both nominations was unanimous.

Approval of Minutes
Draft minutes of the December 12, 2007 meeting were distributed to the members prior to the meeting. Commissioner Sivert noted 1 correction to the draft. The correction was made and there were no other changes to the draft minutes. Commissioner Tom Sivert moved to approve the draft minutes as submitted. Commissioner Donald Smith seconded the motion. The motion to was unanimously approved.
The Horizon Plan
The Planning Commission required certain documents before giving final approval on the plans submitted for the Horizon Plan. James Hayes representative of Glick/Bohem Architects provided the Commission with the following information:

- Revised Landscape Plan
  Commissioner Don Smith and Zoning Administrator Randy reviewed a revised landscape plan. Commissioner Smith advised the Commission the plan was acceptable. Mr. Hayes pointed out the plan is in accordance to Article 10 of the Development Standards Ordinance. Commissioner Smith advised Mr. Hayes that Live Oaks are the preferred shade tree and he would like to be included in the oversight of landscape planting of the medians.

- Ocean Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) Permit
  Mr. Hayes has provided documentation to the Zoning Administrator from Ocean Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) for construction plan approval.

- Lighting Plan
  The Island House, Beach Club and Lake Site Community Center will feature the same style of lighting fixtures. There will be a demonstration of the lights at a date to be determined. The Architect will notify area villa residents.

- Property Line Division
  Before approving the Beach Club project the lot must be subdivided creating two 5,000 sq. ft. parcels and meeting the requirements of OCRM. The division of the parcels will be included in the amendments of the 2008 Town Zoning Map.

Commissioner Sivert pointed out that a newly adopted Ordinance would allow certain exceptions to setbacks, parking and buffer requirements. He asked Mr. Hayes to list the exceptions.

Mr. Hayes noted that a 50' setback buffer is required between dissimilar uses. There is an encroachment of the buffer between the Spinnaker Beach Houses and Island House. The Spinnakers were constructed prior to the adoption of the Ordinance.

There will be an exception for the parking lot of the Island House. Currently there is a zero lot line between Island House parking and the Atrium Villas. The Atriums were constructed prior to adoption of the Ordinance and did not provide for a setback.

There will be approximately a 10-foot encroachment exception for a section of the Beach Club porch, the south side (ocean side) where a 35’ rear setback is required.
An existing building proposed for towel distribution on the beachside is within the 50-foot setback from the road and will remain in the same location.

There will be an exception to allow approximately 200 parking spaces at the Island House and 185 parking spaces at the Lake Site Community Center. These are less than required.

The Island House roof will exceed the height limitation. A variance granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals will allow construction of the roof at the proposed height 55 feet maximum.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Hayes asked for Planning Commission final approval of the project. Chairman John Hoover asked for a motion to approve The Horizon Plan proposal. Vice-Chairman Cynthia Cornwell moved to approve the entire plan as submitted. Commissioner Donald Smith seconded the motion. The motion to approve was unanimous.

Mr. Hayes will bring the construction plans to the Zoning Administrator to sign and stamp and the plans will proceed to Charleston County’s Planning Department for review.

Marshwood -A Multi-Family Development
Mr. Ed Williams is the developer of Marshwood. The development is located at the end of Long Bend Drive near the Marsh Walk Villas. The plan was originally owned and presented by Ms. Heather Wood. The development plan was approved pending SIPOA ARC final approval. The project was sold to Williams and Associates in 2007.

Mr. Williams presented the project at the Work Session with slight modifications to the plan. The pool will be removed from the plan and a slight shift of the building toward the tennis area and landscaped areas. There will be less impervious area by removing the pool area and a parking area located near Marsh Walk Villas. The building size will not change and there are no setback changes.
The plan will be presented to the SIPOA ARC January 15, 2008 for approval. Hearing no further comments, the Chairman asked for a motion. Commissioner Don Smith moved to give a conditional approval of the plan, pending ARC approval. Mr. Williams will bring the approved plans back to the Planning Commission for final approval. Commissioner Tom Sivert seconded the motion. The motion to approve was unanimous.

Having no further business Commissioner Sivert moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion. The motion to approve was unanimous.

Meeting adjourned 3:08 p.m.

John R. Hoover, Chairman  Lynda Whitworth, Secretary  Date 5/14/08
Correspondence in Support of the Variance Request
(No Messages Received)
Correspondence in Opposition to the Variance Request
(91 Messages Received)
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Kerry McPartland

Address
2020 Long Bend Drive

Email Address
Keerymmcp@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
There are deer that bed and reside here and Marsh bids here that need the green space.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Submitted Information:

Name
Peter Boatti

Address
1361 heron bay loop apt 202

Email Address
pboatti@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
Unsure

Comment
Not in favor of removing any wet lands. What is the purpose of 2 driveways. Why would anyone need to use driveway through MarshWalk property?
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Peter Boatti

Address
2007 marsh walk villas

Email Address
pboatti@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
The motivation for this variance, it seems to me, is to allow the company to build bigger than is presently allowed. Build smaller within the property lines. We need to protect our environment.
Resending due to address error.
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: jackfaught@aol.com
Date: July 6, 2021 at 11:03:36 AM EDT
To: jcronin@townofseabrook.org
Subject: Variance #175
Reply-To: jackfaught@aol.com

Dear Mr. Cronin,

My name is Jack Faught and I am a full time resident at Heron Point Villas, 1801 Longbend Drive, which is directly across the street from the tennis courts referenced in the request for variances in Variance # 175.

I strongly object to the potential approval of this request for Variance. They are asking for relief for 4 different requirements. Three for setback requirements and one for elimination the landscape buffer. It is blatantly obvious from the request that the size of the proposed construction is much to large for this property. I will attend the upcoming meeting on July 30th, but strongly recommend that the request be denied. I don't think it is in the communities best interest to minimize the importance of the setback requirements and landscape buffer because it sets a bad precedent.

At the recent Seabook Island Club public meeting there was strong public comment on the number of members in the SIC versus the available amenities. I don't think it is in the community interest to approve additional high density housing on Seabrook Island.

Additionally as a neighbor directly affected by this project I think that it adversely affects the wildlife that frequent that marsh area that would be impacted by this project.

I would appreciate a response to my objections and the issues that I have pointed out in this message.

Respectfully,

Jack M. Faught
610-703-8898
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Jonathan Cooper

Address
12017 Royal Lytham Court

Email Address
jonwcooper68@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
William Sax

Address
2465 Racquet Club Drive

Email Address
williamsax@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Our marshes need to be protected. Our open areas need to be protected. Our wildlife needs to be protected. Economic benefit to a developer is not a sufficient reason to alter the existing regulations. Prior mistakes in allowed building locations are not justification for new mistakes. Protect the Seabrook environment and let them build the four townhouses the property will allow without further damaging our ecosystem.
July 14, 2021

Town of Seabrook Island  
Board of Zoning Appeals  
2001 Seabrook Island Road  
Seabrook Island, SC 29455

ATTENTION: MR. JOSEPH CRONIN, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

Re: Application No. 175

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

I am submitting this letter on behalf of the Horseshoe Cove Townhomes Residents and Board of Directors.

We strongly object to the request for multiple variances submitted by an Applicant in the above-referenced matter.

The Applicant seeks set-back variances to enable them to build 12 townhomes on a site which, under current zoning, would allow four units.

The Zoning Ordinance itself states “The fact that property may be utilized more profitably, if a variance is granted, may not be considered grounds for a variance”. The Applicant states in its application, in Item No. 3 that the current zoning “would allow for about four townhomes of similar size”. There is no indication that the property cannot be used as currently zoned. The entire basis for their application is that they can more profitably (i.e., build more units) utilize the tract if the variances are granted. The rule that economic factors may not be the basis
for a variance is not only clearly stated in the Town’s Zoning Ordinance, but is black-letter law in almost every jurisdiction in the United States, including South Carolina.

In addition, although not strictly a zoning matter, the proposed driveway entering onto a sharp bend on Long Bend Drive would create serious traffic danger.

For all of the aforesaid reasons, we strenuously object to the requests for variances.

Very truly yours

Henry R. Newton
1909 Long Bend Drive
Johns Island, SC 29455
Dear Zoning Board,

Please say "no" to any variances that harm the public and quality of life by:

1 - Exposing us to more flooding by paving over the natural absorption offered by trees and soil. I live in a Horseshoe Cove town home (down the street) and have witnessed first hand the effects of rising oceans. We have had to extend our dock walkway over 10 feet in the past decade due to increasing water encroachment toward our homes. If that continues their variances will put these units in great jeopardy and the rest of us at increased risk.

2 - Reducing habitat for wildlife. Survey after survey shows how Seabrookers appreciate our wild neighbors. That small parcel is the last natural refuge for deer, raccoons etc.on this section of the island.

If the Town, POA, Club and Greenspace collaborated I bet a solution that satisfies all could be found.

Thank you, Harry Polychron 1907 Long Bend Drive.
To: Town of Seabrook Island
From: Robert and Bonnie Bohme
Subject: Proposed construction and variances – Public Hearing 7/30/21
Tax Map: 149-01-00-092
Date: July 21, 2021

We have great concerns for the proposed building and requested variances being proposed by Reynolds-Williams at Marshwood LLC (Owner) / Keith Murphy (Applicant) Please review these comments for the meeting.

We have been coming to this area since 1991, became owners in 2016 and are now full time residents at the Racquet Club Villas. Seabrook Island has won awards as an Audubon International Certified Sustainable Community and watching the development on the island and in the region we hope that distinction will not be in jeopardy. There are serious challenges with flooding, tides, King Tides not to mention the challenges posed by a named storm. Current development around the island threatens the low-country marshes, wildlife and environment in general that Seabrook has tried to be a leader in protecting. Here are our comments and thoughts for the proposed construction and proposed variance requests.

**Water** - We have had water challenges with this marsh area and we appear to be set further back than what is planned for the new development.

Challenges have included:

~**High Tides** encroaching on the live oaks at the back of our building (Building #2) on a regular basis.
~**King Tides** coming in even further towards the carports.
~**Storm Tides** reaching inside our carport area and included 12 inches of standing water in our storage area which is considerably removed from the marsh.
~**Storm water and runoff** increasing the volume of water in the marsh area and connected Racquet Club pond to the point of overflow into the pool thus shutting the pool down and requiring mitigation and additional expenses. (Info on the details of this event have been requested from Ravenel Associates.)
~**Hardscape Runoff** from the proposed construction could impact the bulkhead in front of the Racquet Club building #10 as well as homes at Charles Town Place around the lake.

**Wildlife** -
There is considerable wildlife that will be affected by development in the marsh area. There are several deer that makes their home by the marsh bank at low tide and are frequently spotted lying by the side of the bank. There is a bobcat in the area as well as marsh otters when the tides are up. There are hundreds of birds in the area that will be disrupted by the building and it will take time for them to return following construction.

**Traffic** -
~ At any given time it can be difficult to turn out of the Racquet Club area and on to Seabrook Island Road. Crossing when walking is dangerous and there have been requests every time there is a survey to look at this problem. Adding more volume to this area is troublesome.
~Parking at the Racquet Club is difficult during peak Tennis and Pickle-ball times. Cars regularly park along Long Bend drive.
~The planned cut for the driveway will cross the sidewalk at a blind curve where bikes, walkers and parking occur on a regular basis. This is dangerous.
The pictures attached will show parking on a hot summer day at the Tennis Club. From September-June this area is packed and cars park along the road with the blind curve making it very dangerous to walk, ride, and park.

**Seabrook Island Club** - At the most recent club meeting (6/17/2021) it was stated that Racquet Sports are the fastest growing area on the island. Long term expansion is being discussed. If this is the case, adding more density to an area that already has parking, traffic, and lack of facility issues makes no sense. If there is to be additional growth either through the addition of multifamily dwellings or via the Seabrook Island Club there should be an environmental study done to look at the possible implications of this high flood area.

Please do not approve the variances for encroachment into the marsh for both building #8, for the deck encroachment into the marsh on building #8, as well as for vehicle and construction equipment. Please do not reduce the required easement around the tennis courts. Please reconsider the proposed development and discuss long term planning with the Seabrook Island Club specifically around long term expansion of Racquet Club facilities.

Thank you,
Robert and Bonnie Bohme
2410 Racquet Club Drive

Attachments - pictures:

1-5 Water at normal high tide
6-7 Wildlife
8-10 Traffic Parking
Rockville, Bohicket Creek

LAST TIDE - LOW ↓
12:09 PM
6 hours, 31 minutes ago

NEXT TIDE - HIGH ↑
6:49 PM
8 minutes from now

55+ Apartment Homes
Get Active With Our Onsite Fitness Center, Heated Pool, and Nearby...
Overture West Ashley

Learn More

SUNSET
8:33 PM
1 hour, 52 minutes from now

MOONRISE
4:07 AM
July 19, 2021

Mr. Joseph M. Cronin
Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator
Seabrook Island, SC

Dear Mr. Cronin:

Subject: Opposition to Variance Request for Tax Map # 149-01-00-092 (Variance # 175)

Please accept this letter as confirmation of Charlestowne Place Homeowner’s Association’s strong opposition to the requested variance requests to reduce marsh setbacks as outlined in the Subject line above and your Notice of a Public Hearing regarding the same. We strongly believe that if granted, these actions will have a negative impact on the natural coastal environment that we are all privileged to enjoy here on Seabrook, and that the current setbacks have been established to protect.

This letter will also confirm that we have been provided with and reviewed the letter sent to you by the Board of Directors of Racquet Club Villas dated July 13, 2021, and can advise that we are in agreement with and join in to the well laid out objections in that very letter. The objections we are referring to include:

(a) In the application the property owner and developer state that these conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity. To make this case, they referenced the Seabrook Schematic Concept dated 5/10/2021 on pages 5 and 7 and stated: “The adjacent Marsh Walk Trace Condominium building is within a few feet of the tennis courts, and does not allow for a 50’ buffer separation. Through GIS observation by the Civil Engineer, the adjacent Marsh Walk Trace also appears to overstep their 25’ OCRM Setback.” In these references to the Marsh Walk Condominium buildings, please note that the Marsh Walk Condominiums were built in 1984, before the Development Standards of the Town of Seabrook Island were passed, approved, and adopted by Council for the Town of Seabrook Island, South Carolina on November 22, 2011, with subsequent sections added from 2012 -2021. Therefore, this is not justification for approval of the requested variance based on development of property in 2021. We have learned so much about protecting our coastal environment since 1984 and need to uphold zoning requirements that are aesthetically pleasing and protect the wetlands in our area.
(b) To address this part of the application which states “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” the applicants state: “Would not allow for a road access from Long Bend Drive and reduce the buildable land area by approximately 60%. This would limit the development of this property as currently proposed, and allow for about 4 town homes of similar size.” Yes, this could reduce the buildable land area, but it would not prohibit the utilization of the property by the owner. The applicants could still build a fewer number of town homes, but the property could be developed in compliance with the zoning requirements.

(c) To address this part of the application which states: “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:” The applicants state that their proposed building design with approval of the requested variances will enhance the overall unique character of Seabrook Island.

We believe that approval of the requested variances has the potential for detrimental effects on our natural resources and on neighboring properties. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) states that wetlands are important because they protect and improve water quality, provide fish and wildlife habitats, store flood waters, and maintain surface water flow during dry periods. They serve as storm surge protection and wind buffers during hurricanes and coastal storms. They provide aesthetic value to residential communities and reduce erosion. The EPA encourages protection of the function of wetlands in our area and states that when developing property, we should maintain wetlands and adjacent buffer strips as open spaces. We should avoid wetland alteration or degradation during construction. Existing laws are for protection of our natural resources and not to diminish their value.

Based on the objections outlined above, The Board of Directors of Charlestowne Place Homeowners Association strongly urge the Seabrook Island Board of Zoning Appeals to uphold the zoning requirements that have been put in place to protect our property and it’s natural resources. Accordingly we are requesting that the Seabrook Island Board of Zoning appeals deny the requests for these zoning variances.

With Regards,

The Board of Directors for Charlestowne Place Homeowner’s Association:

Karen Lawson, Gala Bauer, Jonathon Davidson
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Margaret Wildermann

Address
3138 Privateer Creek Rd

Email Address
mlwildermann@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Decreasing the setback and encroaching on the marsh is counter to all environmental standards and the culture of Seabrook Island. We need to protect the marshes surrounding our island, limit the amount of impervious surface, limit tree removal and runoff. This request should be denied. The environmental impact of this proposed variance is too great.
I'm writing to voice my objections to Variance #175 proposed by Reynolds-Williams at Marshwood LLC.

I have been coming to Seabrook since 1996, and have been a full time resident and owner at 1912 Long Bend Drive since 2018. I have lived here long enough to see first-hand the increased intrusion of water onto my property along side these marshes. Simply stated, this is not the time for further construction in this area, and certainly not the time allow building that further encroaches on these marshlands. It threatens not only the low-country marshes but the wildlife and the general environment many of us have worked to preserve. Specific to the proposed construction and variance requests, let me point out the most important negative impacts:

**Traffic:** Car and routine delivery truck traffic all along Long Bend Drive is already heavy throughout the week. Pedestrian traffic, especially when crossing by the Racquet Center, is already dangerous. The planned cut for the new driveway will cross the sidewalk at a blind curve where bikes, walkers and car traffic are already heavy. Adding more volume to this area is simply an “invitation to disaster”.

**Water:** We already have water challenges in this area that affect existing housing, including:

- **Higher Tides** that encroach, on a regular basis, on the live oaks at the back of Horseshoe Cove buildings.
- **King Tides** that cover the rock retaining wall on the Salt Marsh side of my townhouse.
- **Storm/Heavy Rain water** that floods our parking lots and runs off into my yard.

**Seabrook Island Club:** Member dissatisfaction with the Club has featured prominently in recent emails and meetings -- driven, at least in part, by an increase in the number of Club members and the full-out use of amenities by members, guests and renters.

**Wildlife:** There are several deer that make their home by the marsh bank where these five (5) multi-story, multi-family building are planned. There is a bobcat in the area as well as marsh otters when the tides are up. There are hundreds of birds in the area that will be disrupted by vehicle and construction equipment required.

In summary, adding more density to a marshland area that already has parking, flooding, and vehicle congestion issues makes no sense. Based upon these concerns, I am requesting the following:

- Do not approve the requested variances.
- Do not approve this multi-story, multi-family housing construction plan.
- Do not approve any aspect of construction on this site until a thorough analysis is conducted which assesses the real impact of additional construction on flood risks, environment, wildlife, pedestrian/vehicular traffic and Club amenities.

Thank you,

Sue Dostal
“Memories Are More Important Than Possessions”
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Genie Panaccione

Address
2756 High Hammock Road

Email Address
Utpc681@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
This variance is inconsistent with the agenda for more green space. Many cities across the US have suffered and have flooding issues due to over development and reducing setbacks. We do not want SI to get overdeveloped and should do all we can to protect this marsh area. This would be a great purchase for the Greenspace Conservancy versus construction of units in an area lacking the space for them.
Opposition To Irresponsible Marsh Encroachment

As 10-year full-time residents of Marsh Walk Villas, we would like to comment on the sweeping variance proposals being considered for an adjoining property on Long Bend Drive.

Proponents of the development reportedly boast of having “POA approval” for their plans, which include aggressive marsh encroachment and outright elimination of the SIPOA-proscribed landscape barrier between their proposed development and Marsh Walk Villas (MWV). We can only assume that this approval was granted pending the granting of those variances, a critical omission in their promotional effort. That puts the responsibility for resisting such irresponsible development squarely on the shoulders of the Seabrook Island community. Hence the public notice placards on the property.

As a former president of MWV board of directors and representative to COVAR (Council of Villas and Regimes), I can attest to SIPOA’s oft-stated sensitivity to the legitimate concerns of the villa/regime community. But no such sensitivity would be reflected in permitting the construction of an oversized facility whose access path is so inadequate that the privacy of neighboring owners must be sacrificed to accommodate it. One can only wonder if elimination of the island-wide landscape barrier requirement would be seriously considered if the effected neighbors were private home owners rather than merely villa owners. I think not. Approval of these variance requests would indicate that the longstanding two-tiered system of Seabrook governance remains intact.

The general Seabrook community is probably unaware that the banks of our marsh are receding steadily, requiring the neighboring regime, Horse Shoe Cove, to install a retaining structure along their entire length several years ago. Marsh Walk Villas has budgeted for and is planning a similar stabilizing structure in the very near future. Allowing a new building to crowd the marsh bank more aggressively than ever before just makes no sense. Worse, it would clearly demonstrate how little environmental protection really matters when stacked up against economic pressures. The revenue from twelve more Club memberships and twelve more SIPOA annual fees will amount to a tidy sum over time. Approval would suggest that the unhealthy influence The Club has historically exerted over SIPOA also remains intact.

We strongly support the rights of landowners to appropriately develop their properties. Development of some magnitude can no doubt be supported by the tract of land in question. It’s the responsibility of local authorities to ensure that this development fits the site, leaves the environment relatively unharmed and respects the reasonable
expectations of neighboring property owners. Approving these proposed variances will abandon all of those goals in the interest of generating income. The proposed variance requests should be denied and the owners should be encouraged to design facilities appropriate to the site or, better yet, SIPOA or Seabrook Island Club might look into purchasing the land outright and protecting it from development altogether. As the island approaches a “built-out” condition, preservation of this environmentally delicate site would be a laudable use of discretionary funds.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bob and Vicky Becker
I don't support the variance application. The marshes change over the years and the required setbacks provide for those natural variations. Easing the buffer space between the proposed buildings and the adjacent tennis court properties will create tight spaces and defeat the purpose of maintaining natural spaces throughout the island.

Anne Bavier 3132 Privateer Creek Rd, Johns Island, SC 29455
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Mark and Melissa Andrews

Address
2929 Baywood Drive

Email Address
Andrews.melissa56@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Why would you allow further encroachment on a marsh when you know that sea levels are rising?

Why would you allow buildings to be built whose foundations could be flooded?

We should be preserving our marches and allowing them to function as they need to in a coastal environment subject to storms.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Cynthia B Brown

Address
2481 Seabrook Island Rd

Email Address
Cbbrowncpa@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
It feels like the Island is near saturation especially when it comes to our roads and their safety for pedestrian bikers and drivers. We still have many more individual residences which can be developed and enabling a high concentration development not alone one that does not fit our building requirements does not seem to make good sense for our residents.
Hi Mr. Cronin

My name is Andy Allen. My wife Diane and I have owned a home here for over forty years and have lived here full time for more than twenty years. In that time we have seen major changes in the island, not all for the better but all within code or a reasonable variance.

All the setback lines are the length they are for sound reasons. The zoning variance request for the property by Marsh Walk and the tennis center should be turned down. It is not reasonable. We do not need more people on the island but more importantly we don’t need more concrete on the island, especially when it replaces porous soil. This desire to add a parking lot and another building will contribute to even more flooding problems. This may not happen the first few years but the ocean is rising and so the marsh at high tide will steadily get closer to the current setbacks, let alone shorter ones. I doubt the builder has any intention to agree to tear down whatever is built when the marsh rises.

As residents we have a responsibility to be good stewards of the land, to protect it and all the wildlife that thrive here. Certainly easing any of the setback lines is not being that good steward. Please turn down this variance request. And please forward this to any folk that are involved in this decision. Unfortunately I won’t be able to participate in the hearing.

Respectfully

Andy Allen
2600 Jenkins Point Rd.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
M.L. Froude

Address
510 Cobby Creek Lane

Email Address
mlfroude@yahoo.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Please do not approve this variance. Yet another multi-family unit is not needed on our small island. SI has an opportunity here to leave some greenspace.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Sue Parkins Cameron

Address
322 Beach Club Villa

Email Address
spcameron@bex.net

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
The appeal should not be approved due to environmental and personal impact:

We should not allow further infringement into or toward natural habitat.

The flooding problem is made worse by adding more ground level solid surface and structures.

Those who purchased neighboring properties were presented with sight lines and habitat based on the current standard and will be harmed by the change.
Hello. My husband and I own property on eabrook Island. We are deeply concerned about the upcoming variance meeting re new construction by the tennis courts. We are solidly opposed to this new construction due to many issues overcrowding, preservation of wildlife, recent issues with management, club response, etc. just to name a few things.

As we are not on the island full time, we are officially requesting how we can electronically submit our concerns and disappointment re this latest development. Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Regards,
Laura Wendling
02 Ridle Trail Drive
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Laura Wendling

Address
4028 Bridle Trail Drive Seabrook Island

Email Address
Lmwendli@att.net

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I'd like to voice my vehement opposition to the approval of Variance #175. I am completely opposed to this new construction and all its associated variables for a number of reasons. 1) this variance and construction destroys a long-standing sanctuary for the island's wildlife. For an area that states it is sustainable, etc., we do not seem to have any problem as of late regarding destroying land, natural resources, etc., to line the pockets of the developers with more cash and profit. 2) We bought our home three years ago, due to the lack of commercial development, sense of community, respect of nature and the island and SIPOA's supposed commitment to retaining these treasures. It's what makes Seabrook so special. Since our purchase, we have witnessed a rapid and concerning decline in amenities and respect for this habitat due to overcrowding and greed. Since COVID, the island has been overrun with tourists and both short- and long-term renters. Unfortunately, most of them do not care nor wish to abide by the rules that are in place re: preservation of the dunes, obeying speed limits, fireworks, noise. etc. - you name it, we've seen it. It's like visiting Myrtle Beach or Wisconsin Dells, which is NOT what we are paying all these due,
fees and taxes for. One just needs to take a look at Next Door on any given day for complaints and pictures. I try to avoid this social media platform, but it is hard to negate or dismiss the concerns of so many people all saying the same thing - we are ruining the island, destroying its resources, things are being mismanaged, and things need to change. The latest petition garnering over a 1,000 signatures attests to this fact and the growing concern of residents. This construction, in addition to destroying more of the natural wildlife sanctuary and feel of the island, will also promote more renters, without adequate space for parking for the number of guests allowed per unit. You are also adding more people to an already congested island and single road, that does not have walking or bike paths, where the rules are not enforced to begin with.

(Frankly, each time my husband or I walk to the pool or run or bike on the road, it is now COMMON for us to have some sort of "close call" from a driver speeding - either passing us on our bikes on the middle island, almost hitting us, or speeding or hitting us as we walk or run - it's become quite frightening to witness and experience and it will be a matter of time before we read about someone being hurt or hit...) 3) I find it interesting that at a time where there now is reduced inventory for Seabrook Island Realty to sell and make a profit, we now have these new communal residences surging ahead. It's a blatant greed response to make money at the expense of the current owners' needs and what has been promised by SIPOA re: resident concerns being heard and preserving the sanctity of our community. My understanding is that SIPOA also approved this construction/variance - which is quite alarming as well, especially due to all the recent issues that have transpired with the club re: allegedly mismanaging finances, not listening to residents to whom they supposedly serve, having issues with the food service and amenities, golfing accessibility issues for members, promoting misleading marketing - just to name a few of the items addressed in the petition and recent board meeting response in June. And yet, here we are, with the club manager resigning, the above issues still not being adequately addressed (e.g., amenity card access verification, coolers, beach garbage and violations, staff not checking cards or enforcing provisions, etc.) SIPOA still finds the time to approve the construction of something that will just add more chaos and problems into an already existing "mess" - for lack of a better word. More overcrowding. More destruction of our natural resources that can't be fixed or returned to us. More placating communication stating residents are being "heard" when in reality SIPOA is seemingly sneakily going behind residents' backs and do whatever they'd like and not take majority opinions into consideration. It is also interesting to me that the city and SIPOA will take months to review something as minor as putting in screens on an existing porch (it took us four months for this approval - another friend close to five months for another minor approval ??) and will monitor whether businesses have the appropriate licensing card(s) to do work on the island, but seemingly have no problems or hesitation about just destroying the land, trees, and wildlife havens. Again, I ask what is the motivation and the ultimate result and who benefits? Residents certainly are not coming out ahead lately, that's for certain based on the community response. When was the last time the community had a signed petition addressing all the above matters? Bottom line - this construction and variance are wrong. It is wrong to keep destroying wildlife when promises were made to preserve it. It's wrong to ignore the issues associated with all the recent
overcrowding that have yet to be addressed, and more construction and destruction of nature just add to this. It's wrong to ignore the real issues associated with the overcrowding and the results of too much construction so others on the island and developers can profit. It is wrong to turn the other way and not acknowledge that the island does not have the infrastructure or staff to accommodate any more people or consequences of more misguided construction. I strongly urge the board and city to deny this construction and variance and take a long hard look at the direction where we are headed and the ramifications from this current trajectory. I also strongly encourage the city and board to focus on fixing what is currently "broken" and not working, before proposing any new construction changes, or additional destruction to the island. Thank you for taking the time to review and consider my correspondence. Regards, Laura Wendling
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Steve Wendling

Address
4028 Bridle Trail Drive

Email Address
steven.wendling@abbott.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I am solidly opposed to this new construction due to many issues - overcrowding, preservation of wildlife, recent issues with management, club response, etc. - just to name a few things. I see no reason we should be allowing the proposed setback variances – these rules were established for a reason and should not be haphazardly dismissed for the benefit of one person or entity over that of the community.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Cindy Leonard

Address
1009 Crooked Oaks Lane

Email Address
Cclyankee@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I am very opposed to changing any setback requirements on the Marsh, especially for aggregate housing. I drove down the street today, and it is already terribly congested. Please deny this variance on environmental and quality-of-life issues. Thank you.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
A Prentice Barnes

Address
1903 Long Bend Dr.

Email Address
aseabrookisland@comcast.net

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Dear Mr. Cronin,

I am a property owner at 331 Seabrook Island Road. I am opposed to the above captioned variance. Not one of the standard reasons are given for granting a variance. Examples: Showing the owner cannot realize a reasonable return on the property as zoned, granting the variance will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, mitigating adverse effect or impact on the environment etc. Also how is this not self-created? The property was purchased knowing what the restrictions were.

Regards,

Stephen Parziale
I object to this variance. It will encroach on the marsh creating more runoff. It should be a free space. This variance is not in the best interest of the eabrook community. Please do not allow it to go forward. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone
My husband David Jones and I are very much opposed to allowing this variance. It will not only set a precedent for future fragile sites around the island but also will be detrimental to the surrounding wildlife and aquatic animals. This island is rapidly being destroyed by over developing and over renting. This has to stop in order for the concerned citizens to start the repair and recovery of this beautiful island. Eabrook leaders have taken this island down a dangerous resort and rental route which can only lead to its destruction. Our attention to this matter is greatly appreciate,
Margie Ann and David Jones
0 Marsh ate Drive

ent from my iPhone
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Darren Lawson

Address
2427 Seabrook Island Road

Email Address
Kwlawson2427@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
This appears to undermine all that the setbacks are established for - to protect our coastal resources and preserve the wildlife. We are also concerned about water run off and problems that could be created.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Cynthia Davis

Address
2595 Jenkins Point Rd

Email Address
gmmia02@yahoo.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Granting these requested variances would most definitely not be in the best interests of the town of Seabrook. I strongly oppose encroaching on the marsh, especially as our community is facing increasing threats from flooding. We need to protect our current residents and visitors and be good stewards of this special island. Please do not put the financial interests of developers above those who live here.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Stephen Penkhus

Address
2556 clear marsh road

Email Address
spenkhus@hickorytech.net

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
This is an unreasonable amount and extent if variance requests. Why have setbacks if they can be totally ignored. It would set a terrible precedent for Seabrook Island when loss of green space is already a serious concern. Please don't let this happen.
I am concerned about the variance on Marshwalk Terrance; please consider the environmental impact (habitat and flooding) and the effect on the neighboring properties, who paid for a clear view. In addition, in my opinion, it does not meet any of the requirements for a variance. I hope those variance will not be approved.

Thanks you, Kim Wesson
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Peggy and Alan Todd

Address
2436 Racquet Club

Email Address
ptodd688@yahoo.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
We need to protect our coastal environment by upholding the present zoning requirements that were instituted for this very reason on November 22, 2011. If we do not protect now, then when? The adjacent properties referenced were built in 1984, before the impact on the environment was fully understood and, thus, the new zoning requirements were instituted in 2011. The property in question should be developed in compliance with the zoning requirements, which would call for a lesser number of units, but still a buildable property. The existing zoning requirements are for the protection of our natural resources and benefits all Seabrookers.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Joleen Ardaiolo

Address
2132 Loblolly Ln, Seabrook Island

Email Address
joardaiolo@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
There is a disturbing amount of legitimate building on the island. Lots that were full of trees and vegetation to naturally protect our island against the encroachment of weather and tides and that were formerly havens for birds and wildlife are being replaced by large homes and manicured lawns with irrigation systems and yard lighting systems to highlight nonnative plantings. However, these are lots that were available for purchase and the builder/homeowners are following the rules that were set in place for a reason.
This request for a variance for a multi family residence building's parking lot to encroach on the marsh area is distressing for a multitude of reasons and goes against of how Seabrook Island promotes itself to be more concerned with preserving and protecting the environment than over developing the island for the money. Please consider all the future environmental implications and not just the loss of profit from rejecting this variance.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Suzanne and Kevin Boyle

Address
1905 Long Bend Road

Email Address
Suzanneboyle01@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Variance request would have negative impact in terms of building mass, environment, marsh, traffic, people and is not congruent with concept of a sustainable Seabrook Island
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Charles Bebko

Address
1224 Creek Watch Trace

Email Address
Chasb3153@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Seabrook is renowned for its conservation efforts in spite of the need to bow to developers. Using the argument that “they did it so we should too” (the citing of the other pertinent similar variance) holds no quarter here. Should we not learn from our experiences? Thanks for reading.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Christi Bebko

Address
1225 Creek Watch Trace

Email Address
chb0925@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I strongly object to granting this variance. Please...no more disturbing our marshes and green spaces with developments. Apparently it's been done before? Let's not make that mistake again.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Daniel Parker

Address
1911 Long Bend Drive

Email Address
dparker@cinci.rr.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I live on Long Bend Drive and I am strongly against this variance request due to many problems it will create. It will ruin the local habitat, eliminate valuable greenspace and vulnerable marsh land. It will destroy wildlife and their homes. It will add to flooding problems. It will increase vehicle traffic on our street which is not desired. The corner at which they wish to build a new road entrance is already dangerous with lots of cars coming and going from the tennis courts. My wife and I have had several near accidents in this area with oncoming traffic driving in the wrong side of the road due to the curve and dense vegetation. Seabrook Island is already over-crowded and further building development should cease, especially in the marsh and wetland areas, to preserve the natural beauty of our island. Please do not let this development happen. It is not wanted or needed. Thank you.
Thank you very much for the public notice on the below matter

Variance Request for Tax Map #01-00-092 (Variance #175)

We Michelleullerton and Michelle Schoenfeld are the owners of Beach Club Villas on Seabrook. We picked Seabrook as our home due to its natural beauty, landscaping and the wildlife and natural habitats. It’s critical that as new homes are built or homes are renovated a careful balance is committed to between the needs/desires of the home/landowners and the Seabrook community at large including our wildlife.

This land was bought with the full knowledge of our set back requirements on the island which protect our natural habitats and help keep a balance between homes and the natural beauty that surrounds our homes.

We must not change set back requirements or eliminate landscaping buffers for commercial gain. This sets a dangerous precedent and does not protect the wildlife that uses these setbacks to safely travel around our island. The owners clearly knew they could only build on 0 of the land when they bought. Why should this be changed, as there is no benefit to the community or to our wildlife, and the owners make no recommendations or efforts to minimize natural impacts. Their focus is all on what works for the them in terms of building more on the property.

We strongly object to this and other variances to set backs and landscaping buffers as they diminish our and other home owners ability to enjoy the natural beauty of our island and have a negative impact on the wildlife we should all be working to ensure always calls Seabrook home.

Please deny this request.

Beach Club Villas
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Karen Barnola

Address
3113 Seabrook Island Rd

Email Address
kengland.barnola@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
The setbacks are there for several reasons as already explained. We have lost many green spaces due to overbuilding on the island with destruction of habitats. We are having known problems with rats eating into automobile wiring causing expensive repairs. Because of climate change, high tides are eroding our coastline and causing inland flooding. With maintaining and adding green spaces, encouraging growth of dunes through plantings and capital projects to slow the erosion along with a moratorium for building permits and reducing island population, we may be able to save our island and our homes. I am not an engineer or an environmental scientist, but am a homeowner who recognizes the emergency of immediate action, and am ready to volunteer in any way I can to assist in helping to save and protect our beautiful island.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Walter Brooks

Address
2746 Old Forest Drive

Email Address
wrbrooks70@yahoo.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
This variance will be extremely detrimental to the ecological health of SI. We already have issues with flooding, which are probably going to get worse. Variances involving wetlands should not be granted due to the likelihood of increased flooding.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
James Hatley

Address
2647 Persimmon Pond Seabrook Island, SC 29455

Email Address
Mickhatley@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Kathleen Hatley

Address
2647 Persimmon Pond Seabrook Island, SC 29455

Email Address
Mickhatley@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Dear Joe,

Please refuse the variance Application #175. It is appalling on all points. I can’t believe it has any POA approval.

Thank you Very Much,

Linda Bell
110 Pines Pine Dr.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Tracey Wright

Address
730 Spinnaker Beachhouse VL

Email Address
tswright61@yahoo.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
We have seen significant growth on the island with little to no apparent steps taken by the town or SIPOA to prepare for this change. This request is not environmentally in the best interest of the community or protected our natural resources. The town is very strict on maintaining codes and not allowing exceptions of its individual homeowners. One would think there is something else happening behind the curtain that must be occurring. Perception is Reality!
Mr. Cronin,

Please include in your records our complete OPPOSITION to Variance 1.

We are property owners and full time owners on Seabrook Island and we believe these requests are egregious, especially the request

LIMITED OR OOT LA DSCAP D B R ALO TH SHAR D PROP RT LI WITH TM 190-00-0 (S ABROOK ISLA D RAC T CL B/T IS CO RTS)

This request affects the aesthetics of the island by the tennis courts for V R property owner and should unilaterally be denied. It hurts every owner and I hope the town will do what is best for V R O.

All setbacks and buffers on parcels in this delicate echo system and residential community are there for a reason and the Town/oning Board should uphold them.

Thank you,
Brian and Tracey irchoff

Sent from my iPhone
To the Board of Appeals in care of Joe Cronin

Now is definitely not the time to grant any variance for encroachment of our delicate marsh environment in favor of further and denser development of the island. The island is already struggling to adjust to increases in crowds of new owners and renters which increase the usage of the island facilities, roads, and infrastructure. Island residents are dramatically concerned about the issues surrounding the increased crowds and the changing character of the island. These concerns are tangible and cannot be ignored. Granting variances which lead to denser development and deeper marsh encroachment now is wrongheaded at best. We must be sure we can maintain the unique beauty and character of our island with development that is within our ordinances, a conclusion which currently is in doubt, before we grant variances to allow increase stress and overuse of our island and all its facilities.

Please do not grant any variances for this property.

Marilyn and Larry Margolis
Owners - 1 Laughingull Ln

Sent from my iPad
ood morning, oe.
Would you please transmit this letter to the Board regarding the proposed zoning variance
Thank you.

Dear Board of oning Appeals

As property owners on Seabrook Island, we very much disagree with the plan to grant the developers a zoning variance near the tennis facility (variance 1 ).

There are issues at play here which should be carefully considered. irst, the amount of building in SB Island is unprecedented, and it is not in the interest of property owners and residents to permit construction of another multi-unit residential project.  These often offer short-term rentals, and the additional number of residents and visitors detracts from our enjoyment of the island.  One reason many of us are attracted to SB Island is the paucity of people on the island, at the beaches and using the facilities.

The other objection we have is the encroachment on marshland inherent in the proposal to narrow the distance between construction and marsh.  We believe that these boundaries are in existence for a reason to preserve the delicate ecosystem of the island’s land.  This seems to be an unwise plan anyway based on rising sea levels in the southeastern S. and the probability that the marsh location will change with time.

We hope you will take these factors into consideration when deciding on this allowance.  We would venture to say that the vast majority of SB Island residents would not want to approve anything that has a deleterious effect on our ecosystem, not to mention property values.

Respectfully submitted,

effrey and Polly ramer
11 Seabrook Village Dr.
From: Timot y Finan
To: Joe Cronin
Subject: TT: alter ewell C air, oard o oninppeals Variance #175
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 10:39:50 M

As a Seabrook Island homeowner, please be advised of my strong opposition to the proposed building variance on property adjoining the Tennis Center (Variance 1). I believe that any variance with respect to currently required setbacks would be problematic for multiple reasons and provide obvious benefits that would accrue only to the benefit of project developers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Timothy inan
00 Bridle Trail Dr.
Seabrook Island, SC
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Mary Fleck

Address
2639 Seabrook Island Road

Email Address
marybfleck@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
As a property owner and tennis player, I have significant concerns about the negative impact this construction variance, if approved, will have on our use of the tennis courts in that area as well as the impact on flooding, loss of animal habitats, congestion in that area, and increased demand for already stretched facilities on Seabrook Island. I ask you to reject this request for variance. Preferrably, that area should be designated as GreenSpace.
To: Joseph M. Cronin, Town Administrator / Zoning Administrator

From: Board of Directors for Racquet Club Villas Horizontal Property Regime

Subject: Opposition to Variance Request for Tax Map # 149-01-00-092 (Variance # 175)

Date: July 13, 2021

The purpose of this letter is to express strong opposition to the requested variance requests to reduce marsh setbacks and eliminate the required 50-foot landscaped buffer along the shared property line with Tax Map # 149-01-00-093. The primary reason for our objections is the actual and potential impact the variances will have on our natural coastal environment. The established minimal marsh setbacks are in place to protect our coastal wetlands and resources, as listed in section 7.60.50 of the Developmental Standards of the town of Seabrook Island (DSO). Section 10.30.00 of the DSO discusses the requirement for the 50-foot landscape buffer between dissimilar properties. The established zoning requirements for the land use on Seabrook Island are consistent with the stated vision of the town of Seabrook Island: “To be a residential community where growth is managed, commercial development activities are limited, and the natural environment is preserved, while respecting the rights of individuals and their property.”

(a) In the application for the zoning variance submitted by the property owner and developer, they indicate that the zoning requirements established by the town of Seabrook Island and state law will result in extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to their piece of property. We do not see that following the zoning guidelines to protect our marshes and to establish a landscape buffer between non-complimentary land uses creates an extraordinary and exceptional condition pertaining to the property in question.

(b) In the application the property owner and developer state that these conditions do not generally apply to other property in the vicinity. To make this case, they referenced the Seabrook Schematic Concept dated 5/10/2021 on pages 5 and 7 and stated: “The adjacent Marsh Walk Trace Condominium building is within a few feet of the tennis courts, and does not allow for a 50’ buffer separation. Through GIS observation by the Civil Engineer, the adjacent Marsh Walk Trace also appears to overstep their 25’ OCRM Setback.” In these references to the Marsh Walk Condominium buildings, please note that the Marsh Walk Condominums were built in 1984, before the Development Standards of the Town of Seabrook Island were passed, approved, and adopted by Council for the Town of Seabrook Island, South Carolina on November 22, 2011, with subsequent sections added from 2012 -2021. Therefore, this is not justification for approval of the requested variance based on development of property in 2021. We
have learned so much about protecting our coastal environment since 1984 and need to uphold zoning requirements that are aesthetically pleasing and protect the wetlands in our area.

(c) To address this part of the application which states “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” the applicants state: “Would not allow for a road access from Long Bend Drive and reduce the buildable land area by approximately 60%. This would limit the development of this property as currently proposed, and allow for about 4 town homes of similar size.”

Yes, this could reduce the buildable land area, but it would not prohibit the utilization of the property by the owner. The applicants could still build a fewer number of town homes, but the property could be developed in compliance with the zoning requirements.

(d) To address this part of the application which states: “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:” The applicants state that their proposed building design with approval of the requested variances will enhance the overall unique character of Seabrook Island.

We believe that approval of the requested variances has the potential for detrimental effects on our natural resources and on neighboring properties. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) states that wetlands are important because they protect and improve water quality, provide fish and wildlife habitats, store flood waters, and maintain surface water flow during dry periods. They serve as storm surge protection and wind buffers during hurricanes and coastal storms. They provide aesthetic value to residential communities and reduce erosion. The EPA encourages protection of the function of wetlands in our area and states that when developing property, we should maintain wetlands and adjacent buffer strips as open spaces. We should avoid wetland alteration or degradation during construction. Existing laws are for protection of our natural resources and not to diminish their value.

The Board of Directors of Racquet Club Villas Horizontal Property Regime strongly urge the Seabrook Island Board of Zoning Appeals to uphold the zoning requirements that have been put in place to protect our property and our rich natural resources in coastal South Carolina and deny the requests for these zoning variances.

The Board of Directors for Racquet Club Villas Horizontal Property Regime:

Phyllis Barber, Beverly Bradley, John Perreault, Bill Sax, and Kristine Wilson

Phyllis Barber Chairman
Joyce M. Kruller 2407 Racquet Club
Curt R. Kruller 2407 Racquet Club
Donnie L. Bohne 2410 Racquet Club
Christopher and Debra Davis 2405 Racquet Club
Robert L. Bohne 2410 Racquet Club Dr.
Post a message, event, poll or alert to your neighborhood

Steve Pollock ([profile/15410343/?is=feed_author]) • Seabrook Island (neighborhood/seabrookisland~Johns-Island~SC/?source=neighborhood_name) • 1 day ago (p/FpWaVZ6kKzS9?view=detail)

Public Hearing requesting variance for construction. ([p/FpWaVZ6kKzS9?view=detail]) A public Hearing regarding a building variance on property adjoining the Tennis Center is scheduled for Friday, July 30. See below: Variance for Charleston County tax map #149-01-00-092 (Variance #175) Information on this See more...

Posted in General to Seabrook Island

Steve Pollock ([profile/15410343/?is=feed_commenter]) • Seabrook Island (neighborhood/seabrookisland~Johns-Island~SC/?source=neighborhood_name)

Adding to my comment, if you go to townofseabrookisland.org (http://townofseabrookisland.org) and under the link meetings you will be able to open up information on this variance request.

1 day ago Like Reply Share

Glen Cox ([profile/13484622/?is=feed_commenter]) • Seabrook Island (neighborhood/seabrookisland~Johns-Island~SC/?source=neighborhood_name)


23 hr ago Like Reply Share

J-Anna Smith ([profile/13023665/?is=feed_commenter]) • Seabrook Island (neighborhood/seabrookisland~Johns-Island~SC/?source=neighborhood_name)

So I am just a lowly long term renter here. Some would say that I don't have a horse in this race but Nature put the marsh there for a reason and when we start messing with... See more

22 hr ago Like Reply Share

Jackie Dingle ([profile/45529728/?is=feed_commenter]) • Seabrook Island (neighborhood/seabrookisland~Johns-Island~SC/?source=neighborhood_name)

This strip of undeveloped land has been a safe haven for sea wildlife for a long time and there isn't much of it left on the near side of the island.

19 hr ago Like Reply Share

Carol Dane ([profile/13315017/?is=feed_commenter]) • Seabrook Island (neighborhood/seabrookisland~Johns-Island~SC/?source=neighborhood_name)

BILL BANE writes... According to the TOSI Public Hearing Notice: 1) "Reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to 10 feet" 2) "Reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to approximately... See more

21 hr ago Like Reply Share

Sue Dostal ([profile/13326089/?is=feed_commenter]) • Seabrook Island (neighborhood/seabrookisland~Johns-Island~SC/?source=neighborhood_name)

Bill, thanks for the details. I agree this request has significant implications, and not only for those of us who live on Long Bend Drive. We need to be sure our voices are heard!

21 hr ago Like Reply Share

See 3 more replies
Stacey Avent (profile/44023768/?s=feed_commenter) • Seabrook Island
(source=neighborhood/seabrookisland--Johns-Island--SC?)
This property is on the Market, listed with Seabrook Island Realty and is listed as "contingent". The first applicant listed is the person who is listed as "purchaser of the... See more
18 hr ago  Like  Reply  Share

Ralph Poirier (profile/42084827/?s=feed_commenter) • Seabrook Island
(source=neighborhood/seabrookisland--Johns-Island--SC?)
This is unfortunate. I'm not usually one to get in the way of someone making a buck but spending 5 minutes on this app will tell you the last thing the island needs are more... See more
18 hr ago  Like  Reply  Share 2

Cherie Squire (profile/13405873/?s=feed_commenter) • Seabrook Island
(source=neighborhood/seabrookisland--Johns-Island--SC?)
The application states that they have POA approval. The Club has no objection to mandating 12 more memberships. All 12 units are 3 bedrooms, so each allows 8-10 renters under... See more
17 hr ago  Like  Reply  Share

David Illar (profile/24231012/?s=feed_commenter) • Seabrook Island
(source=neighborhood/seabrookisland--Johns-Island--SC?)
The 2 "odd" units; 7 & 10 have an second level sitting room with a window that could become a 4th bedroom, so they could possible be 12 person rentals.
15 hr ago  Like  Reply  Share 1

Jim Logan (profile/29642735/?s=feed_commenter) • Seabrook Island
(source=neighborhood/seabrookisland--Johns-Island--SC?)
Say goodbye to the hawks who have patrolled the area for years...
17 hr ago  Like  Reply  Share 1

Marg Wildermann (profile/53529211/?s=feed_commenter) • Seabrook Island
(source=neighborhood/seabrookisland--Johns-Island--SC?)
Encroaching on the marsh, creating more runoff, adding more impervious surface. Nol Where is the caring community of environmental custodians?
15 hr ago  Like  Reply  Share 4

David Illar (profile/24231012/?s=feed_commenter) • Seabrook Island
(source=neighborhood/seabrookisland--Johns-Island--SC?)
I always thought that this piece of land would be nice green space with a bike path and bridge from the Salt Marsh homes so that Salt Marsh pedestrians could get "secret" walking... See more
15 hr ago  Like  Reply  Share 3

John Burich (profile/18461486/?s=feed_commenter) • Seabrook Island
(source=neighborhood/seabrookisland--Johns-Island--SC?)
Our low country ecosystem is a very special. We all need to help preserve it. I hope the community will support efforts to curb further development like the one proposed. Once... See more
12 hr ago  Like  Reply  Share 7

Add a comment...
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Dutton Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142 Turtle Watch Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sarahgood329@gmail.com">sarahgood329@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you support the approval of Variance #175?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Dear Walter,

I am encouraging you and your committee to vote Against the requested variances captioned above. There are a number of reasons this should not be permitted:

1. The setback standards and regulations in the building code for the Town of Seabrook Island were established for the purpose of maintaining reasonable space between buildings, discouraging encroachment on the marshes and maintaining space for the amazing wildlife around us.

2. The location of the proposed development is already High Density for the Island and to grant the variances requested for this project and allow even greater density is totally against the direction Seabrook Island is going (land and greenspace preservation.).

3. Under no circumstances should a developer be allowed to violate the setback standards around the Marsh. These standards were established to preserve the marsh and to protect the future residents of the buildings against rising sea levels. Before any variance is considered a new OCRM Line should be established.

4. Despite all promises, there will still be a significant negative impact on drainage in the area.

5. The planned entry/exit drive is not well thought out and has traffic from the planned complex exiting onto Longbend Drive at a point, a bend in the road, which is already problematic from both traffic and visibility. It will be an accident waiting to happen.

I could continue with reasons this project should not go ahead with the size planned. But I won’t.

Thank you for giving my comments consideration.

Stephen Montagu-Pollock
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
George A Fleck

Address
2639 Seabrook Island Rd

Email Address
gafleck96@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Submitted Information:

Name
David & Maureen Illar

Address
2022 Long Bend Drive

Email Address
dillar10530@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
1. One of Seabrook’s assets is its beautiful landscaping. We should NOT allow a builder to remove natural fauna without replacing it with landscaping.

2. At a time when the world is experiencing rising sea levels the last thing Seabrook Island should be doing is allowing encroachment on the marsh. This would be against all environmental wetland protections that are already in place. Our island should be an advocate for maintaining and protecting our wetlands not responsible for destroying them.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Cat Russo

Address
2105 Loblolly Lane

Email Address
cat.russo1990@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Please do not vote for this variance. There is already so much housing and tennis courts in this area that by minimizing the set back more the Marsh area will suffer.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Elaine Mansfield

Address
2978 Deer Point Drive

Email Address
emansfield148@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Everyone else, including myself, who has recently built on Seabrook was made to design their home within the guidelines of setbacks and critical lines.
Why would this change?
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Barbara Long

Address
2347 Andell Way

Email Address
Ckbalong@comcast.net

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I am writing to express opposition to the proposed variance for the multi family structure near the tennis courts. I am opposed on several issues. We do not need more housing that develops into rental units on the island. We already have too many rental units that are posing problems all over the island. We don’t need additional multi family units.

Secondly, we don’t need housing that encroaches on the marsh. This particular request is asking for multiple variances to build on restricted marsh areas. Our marshes are a precious resource that attract wildlife and should not be encroached on by developers. If you allow this to be approved, others will begin to look at marsh areas for similar projects.

I encourage Town Council members to vote no.

Susan McLaughlin

Sent from my iPhone
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Nancy Lynn Van Gieson

Address
3203 Wood Duck Pl

Email Address
h2oskiwife@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
We should be doing everything that we can to preserve our greenspace. I totally oppose the variance request and respectfully ask that the Board reject the proposal.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Lester D Dewalt

Address
35 Waterside Dr SE

Email Address
dewalt.lester@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Allowing this variance to build closer to the marsh sets a precedent for future requests and a slippery slope of erosion to the building standards.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Susan Whitehouse

Address
2919 Deer Point Drive

Email Address
Seasusan7@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Terrible precedent to allow this type variance. My husband and I are strongly. Don't allow this to begin on our island.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Submit as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Cindy McCurry

Address
2540 The Bent Twig, Seabrook Island Road

Email Address
mccurycindy1@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
The approval of this variance will be devastating to the wildlife in the area. Property owners adhere to very strict guidelines when building a home or doing any type of improvements to their existing property. It is confusing to me that a variance is being considered at all, especially one this large and this detrimental to the natural beauty of the area and the many wildlife that live there. I would imagine that flooding will only be made worse by granting this variance. I am adamantly opposed to allowing this variance. It is setting a very dangerous precedent.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
William L. Green

Address
1406 Duneloft Villas

Email Address

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Christopher Long

Address
2347 Andell Way

Email Address
Cklong15@comcast.net

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quinn family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>3220 One Needle Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:betsyquinn1@yahoo.com">betsyquinn1@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?  
No - Opposed

Comment  
Absolutely opposed to all variance request for environmental impact as well as addition of multi family buildings.

I recall that when the TOSI was established the total number of residential structures including both single and multi was not to exceed 2400 in total. How many do we have now and when was this number amended?
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Margaret Van Voorhis

Address
446 Double Eagle Trace

Email Address
mcv24@sbcglobal.net

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I am totally against Variance #175. Seabrook should not even consider this and/or any encroachment into the marsh area. Do not reward developers greed over common sense protection of our environment.
Dear Joe,

The proposed variance for increasing the number of units proposed to be built near the tennis courts is unacceptable. The Town must cease granting any more variances that increase the numbers of people living on or short term renters staying on the Island. The Town has already undermined the zoning protection property owners had under the Single Family Residential zoned portions of the Island (check the purposes of this zoning in the Town’s ordinance) when it gave unrestricted permission for short term rental in these areas and increased the flow of guests onto the Island. Approving this request will only make matters worse.

To be clear, this proposal adds more people to an increasingly crowded community, places more demands on our infrastructure, and poses a threat to the natural habitat.

It is time for the Town to act in the best interests of property-owners and reject this request.

Paul D. McLaughlin

Sent from my iPad/iPhone, so please excuse any typos

"...Light can neither emanate from, nor enter into a closed mind. And so for all its limitations, reason - the weighing of evidence, the assessment of likelihood, the capacity to shift one's opinions in light of thought and of experience - remains essential. Without reason, we cannot appreciate complexity; without appreciating complexity, we cannot rightly appreciate the majesty and mystery of God; and without rightly appreciating the majesty and mystery of God, we foreclose the possibility of the miraculous and the redemptive…".

Jon Meacham, "The Hope of Glory"
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Barrie Glenn

Address
3051 Seabrook Island Road

Email Address
bglenn@wd40.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175? No - Opposed

Comment
I do not agree with this builder's wish to encroach further upon the marsh or to eliminate the landscape buffer. The island is seeing significant growth. If we don't say no to requests such as these, continued building growth with all of it's encroachments will and is impeding the wildlife as well as the "flavor" of the island. Build less units, they end up as rentals anyway and we do not need any more of that if we are to retain the spirit of Seabrook that has attracted so many of us to call it our full time homes. It is a known fact that wildlife become desperate after encroachment as it greatly reduces their food sources. They do what comes naturally to them for survival. Sometimes their only option is to hunt in occupied neighborhoods seeking alternate food sources such as garbage found inside of trash cans or even outside pets. Allowing this variance will support new issues on the island such as an increase of rats, predatory animals and even increase road accidents as wildlife continue to try to find new places to roam / live / eat. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), has a stated mission to help "conserve, protect and enhance fish, wildlife and plants and their habitats" and maintains a list of Threatened and Endangered² U.S. species. As of January 3, 2018, it lists...
1,661 animal and plant species and subspecies as threatened or endangered. The list includes 102 birds, including species of warbler, tern, thrush, vireo, quail, the Whooping Crane, the Bald Eagle and the California Condor. Ninety-five mammals are on the list, including wolves, squirrels, rabbits, pumas, deer, caribou, foxes, jaguars, the Florida Panther, and whales. Forty-five reptiles are on the list, too, along with 272 invertebrates, which includes butterflies, snails, insects, and others. The tally for plants is 947, with 903 of those being flowering plants. We cannot call ourselves an "eco friendly" or "environmentally friendly" or "sustainable" community if this variance is allowed. My vote is NO.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Christopher Davis

Address
2405 Racquet Club Drive, Seabrook Island, SC

Email Address
chrisdavis.nc@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I oppose a reduction in both marsh setback requirements. The marsh is frequented by many forms of wildlife and a reduction in either setback will discourage the animals to use this existing habitat. It is important that we preserve these areas.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Phyllis Barber

Address
2401 Racquet Club Drive Johns Island SC 29455

Email Address
pkent0621@charter.net

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
This will be totally detrimental to our property at Racquet Club.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Kathy and Jeff Pompe

Address
2348 Andell Way

Email Address
jpompe@fmarion.edu

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
We strongly object to allowing variance #175. With sea level rise and increased hurricane activity, we should not allow encroachment on marsh areas. Reducing the marsh buffer will make the townhouses more susceptible to damage from flooding and storms. With more impervious surfaces this also will create more runoff into estuaries. In addition, Seabrook Island is experiencing rapid growth that is placing stress on the Island's facilities. There is no good reason to add to that growth with a variance such as this.

When we built our house 11 years ago, we wished to build in a location on our lot that would have given us a little more privacy from a neighboring house. However, this would have required the removal of one live oak; we were restricted from removing that live oak. Variance #175 will create much more damage to the Island environment than removing that live oak tree. Have concerns about the natural environment changed so much? As the Island experiences more economic development, we should be encouraging more protection of the valuable natural resources on Seabrook Island, not encouraging more...
destruction. The natural areas of Seabrook are the attributes that so many in our community find so valuable.
Joe & Board members,

In reference to the Zoning Appeal Variance Application #175, I oppose all requested variances for this application.

Best regards,

Sherry Marshall
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Robert Nerhood

Address
1037 crooked oak lane

Email Address
nerhood@marshall.edu

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
The island is rapidly becoming overpopulated and an abundance of rentals is turning it into a resort. Additional multifamily, read rental units, are unnecessary. More importantly, any proposed development that infringes on marshes and beautifying buffers are absolutely contraindicated.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Joanne Fagan

Address
813 Treeloft Trace

Email Address
Joanne.fagan@comcast.net

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I feel that the Town should not grant this variance. The setbacks requested appear to severely encroach on the adjacent marsh. The elimination of the buffer zone should also be not be granted. With so many changes to the marshes that cannot be controlled due to climate change, the granting of these variances should not be allowed.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
William Townsend

Address
2408 Racquet Club Drive

Email Address
btownsend124@yahoo.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I oppose the approval of this variance.

The natural environmental qualities of Seabrook make it the unique and desirable island that it is.

Infringing on these qualities will only serve to destroy our uniqueness and promote more destruction of our environment.
Dear Mr. Cronin,

My husband Kevin Boyle and I are writing to state our strong objections to Variance #175 proposed by Reynolds-Williams at Marshwood LLC. We reside as full time residents in Horseshoe Cove at 1905 Long Bend Drive. We have reviewed the proposal and find it objectionable on a number of levels. Specifically, the impact of bulk and mass with the proposed townhouse structures will burden an already densely populated zone on Seabrook. The request for a marsh variance does not make sense in light of the rising water levels experienced normally and with King tides in addition to the environmental impact on wildlife. The added volume of traffic creates a hazard on a road that is already busy with Racquet Club traffic. The road has curves and some blind spots presenting a significant safety issue for cars and pedestrians. Furthermore, this variance request does not seem to be aligned with the concept of preserving Seabrook island as a sustainable community.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our concerns regarding this proposal.

Sincerely,

Suzanne M. and Kevin R. Boyle
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
kristine wilson

Address
2418 Racquet Club Dr

Email Address
krisw10@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
will affect wildlife and upset our natural surroundings
We object to the passage of variance #175. The negative environmental impact on the Creek, Wildlife and drainage would be substantial. Please do not agree to this variance.

Janet and John Abbattista
1910 Long Bend Dr.
Janet Abbattista
Sent from my iPad
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
James Newton

Address
3552 Seaview Dr

Email Address
newtonjw1949@yahoo.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
Encroachment into the Marsh buffer area could cause additional flooding, less retention of storm water runoff and just plain unnecessary for this island. New development would further crowd the island put a strain on our water system and in general reduce the ambiance of Seabrook Island. Better would be to update some of the older Regimes. I cannot imagine that anyone who cares about this island would be in favor of this rezoning.

Jim and Sally Newton.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name  
edward mann

Address  
1845 St. Julian

Email Address  
Bud@columbiadevelopment.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?  
No - Opposed

Comment  
Why would this possibly be allowed. We were made to move our buildings back by 10 feet from the original wetland delineation at Salt marsh.
There is plenty of property to develop a multi family project on the right coming onto the Island before you get to the guard house that is zoned multi and needs no variance.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Sherry Vincent

Address
Marsh Haven

Email Address
sherry41vincent@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Lois Hessberg

Address
3450 Deer Run Drive

Email Address
loishessberg@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I have several:
1-this is exceedingly short notice
2-I have objections to encroaching on the marsh in any way
3-the encroachment on club facilities is unsupportable
4-is there truly any need for further construction in this area of Seabrook? Other than for profit, of course.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Kathy Maher

Address
3315 Seabrook Island Road

Email Address
Eksdmaher@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
This is NOT and environmentally sound proposal. This water is tidal. There will be a cause for more flooding if the landscape changes to blackscape. There should not be any building at this site. There are animal habitat that dwell there and that corner is dangerous to begin with when driving so any additional congestion does not serve our community. Please do not grant this variance. Thank you.
Kathy Maher
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Donna Reinbolt

Address
3559 Seaview Drive, Seabrook Island, SC 29455

Email Address
donnareinbolt@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I oppose the 3 requests to reduce the marsh setbacks as well as the request to eliminate the required 50 foot landscaped buffer. The basis for my opposition is as follows:
1) allowing reduced setbacks and the elimination of landscape buffers sets precedence for future requests, which would be detrimental to the overall well-being and character of Seabrook Island;
2) allowing reduced setbacks and elimination of landscape buffers will negatively and permanently impact the adjacent environment;
3) allowing reduced setbacks and elimination of landscape buffers injures adjacent property owners' rights to peaceful enjoyment of their property; and
4) allowing reduced setbacks and elimination of landscape buffers lowers adjacent property values thereby economically damaging owners of said adjacent properties.
Please deny Variance #175. Thank you.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Ken Haderer

Address
2637 seabrook island road

Email Address
ken.haderer@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
The zoned setbacks are in place to ensure the growth of SI maintains our environment and overall appearance. We should not give into forced construction and expansion that does not adhere to our zoning requirements.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Elise haderer

Address
2637 Seabrook island rd

Email Address
ken.haderer@gmail.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Lee Hessberg

Address
3450 DEER RUN DR

Email Address
LHessberg@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I am opposed for several reasons -
1) The marsh area serves to help reduce flooding, and this variance request appears to erode some of that protection. It will also affect the marsh eco systems - the setback is there for a reason.
2) Eliminating the buffer will substantially harm the "value" of the setting for the tennis facilities. I'm opposed both as a user of the facilities and as a member of the club affected by the request.
3) I also believe that the request to ignore the buffer setback would add to the perceived density of the area; it's hard to tell if this also served to actually increase the density of the area and probably traffic at the facility.
4) Notice of this request is entirely inadequate, especially the 3-day notice to the community affected by the request.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Cam Parker

Address
1911 Long Bend Drive

Email Address
Cparker@cinci.red.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
I strongly oppose this variance request for the following reasons: Loss of wildlife habitat, potential flooding problems, increase traffic on long been Drive, damage to our Audubon sanctuary, marsh and habitat. The traffic on long been drive is already a problem due to the tennis, and all the villas already placed.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.

Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Tim B Lanfersiek

Address
2161 Royal Pine Dr Seabrook Island SC

Email Address

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
The variance will continue the destruction of our valuable wetland and wildlife habitats
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Jean Dunn

Address
2956 Seabrook Island Road

Email Address
jeandunn100@bellsouth.net

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
The MLS Listing for 0 Marshwalk Ace Trail clearly states that the "property can accommodate up to 11 units". And yet, the prospective buyer is requesting approval for variances to build 12 townhomes.

Perhaps if he only built the 11 units as advertised, he wouldn't need any variances. He should be required to rethink his business plan and proposed site development to build 11 units without destroying our marshlands.
You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments - Variance #175.
Mark as Spam

Submitted Information:

Name
Anne verini

Address
513 Cobby Creek Lane

Email Address
Amberini@aol.com

Do you support the approval of Variance #175?
No - Opposed

Comment
There are already overcrowding issues during busy season. There are problems with gate access, pool access, restaurant access etc. we do not need more condos. We should not allow a variance. Individual home owners have to jump through hoops for the simplest of changes. Allowing this variance and disrupting the ecosystem is wrong for Seabrook!
VIA E-MAIL

Joseph M. Cronin (jcronin@townofseabrookisland.org)
Zoning Administrator
Town of Seabrook Island

Re: Application #175, Reynolds-Williams at Marshwood, LLC

Dear Mr. Cronin:

On behalf of the Coastal Conservation League, I am submitting comments objecting to the above-referenced variance request. The applicant is seeking a variance to: reduce the marsh setback from 25 feet to approximately 18 feet (§ 7.60.50); to allow for an 8-foot encroachment into the marsh setback for an open deck (§ 9.40.10); and to eliminate the 50-foot landscaped buffer along the shared property line with the Seabrook Island Racquet Club Tennis Courts (§ 10.30). The applicant is proposing to develop twelve townhomes on a 1.81-acre parcel in one of the oldest developed sections of Seabrook Island in the form of an infill project.

The BZA may grant a variance only where it finds the following:

(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 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 applicant fails to meet the four hardship criteria to warrant the multiple variances they seek in order to develop their property for the following reasons:

July 28, 2021
1. No extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to this particular piece of property exist, nor has the applicant attempted to make any such a showing.

   The restrictions applicable to this property are a matter of public record and the conditions around it have existed since the 1980s, including the adjacent tennis courts. The Town of Seabrook’s Buffering of incompatible Uses, which requires a 50-foot setback, was in place long before this developer acquired the property in 2009. Basic due diligence would have revealed this long-standing development standard.

   Locally regulated DHEC-OCRM critical area setback buffers are common throughout the Lowcountry with typical setbacks ranging from 25 feet to upwards of 50 feet. The Town of Seabrook Island’s 25-foot setback from the OCRM critical area is enforced and critically important for the livability and resilience of this barrier island. The buffers landward of the OCRM critical area provide space for marsh migration as our sea level continues to rise, as well as discourage placing structures in areas that are likely to become inundated by seal level rise. Eliminating these buffers would set a dangerous precedent for building in dynamic coastal areas most vulnerable to climate change. In a location as susceptible as this to the negative effects of sea level rise, reducing the required buffer along the marsh is the last thing the Town should do.

   Further, there are no exceptional conditions pertaining to this specific property because the buffer and setback requirements do not eliminate reasonable use of the property, nor has the applicant made such a claim. While they may wish to build more units than what the zoning code allows, such a desire does not constitute exceptional circumstances- and does not exempt them from following the local laws of the Town of Seabrook Island.

2. The comparisons to conditions of other properties in the area are not a basis for granting this variance.

   The applicant argues that the existing buildings and tennis courts in the area do not allow for a 50-foot buffer separation and the existing condominium appears to overstep their 25’ marsh setback. This is an inappropriate comparison; a nearly 30-year-old adjacent property should not be used as a comparison to the standards in place currently for this proposed development. As undeveloped tracts of land become rarer on Seabrook Island, those that remain will have to be more creatively designed to comply with the Town’s development standards. It is to be expected that an infill property such as this will have to work within the boundaries of existing setbacks and buffers resulting from prior development and the location of the critical area. These standards exist for a reason – to maintain a distinct character and sense of place that makes Seabrook Island special and unique.

3. These conditions are not unreasonably restricting the use of the property.

   The applicant argues the setback requirements would prohibit road access from Longbend Drive, reduce the buildable land area by 60% and only allow for about four townhomes of similar size.
A reduction in the number of units from the maximum possible to something less is not an unreasonable restriction. The applicant is charged with knowledge of the law when it took title, thus it knew of the limitations on potential development of this property before acquiring it. Prior to acquisition, due diligence would have revealed that development would not be legally permissible on every square inch of the parcel they purchased. Further, the applicant could pursue other options, such as working with adjacent property owners to improve access and redesign of their buildings.

4. The authorization of the variance would be a substantial detriment to the adjacent property and to the public good, and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance.

Allowing this variance would destroy the vegetated buffer that surrounds one of the oldest sets of tennis courts on Seabrook Island, forever changing the character of this community amenity. Reducing the setback buffers along the marsh would also pose a threat to the adjacent properties and the uses of the public by increasing the risk of erosion and increasing the potential for discharge of harmful pollutants into the marsh that is a natural public resource. The Town should not set a precedent like this.

Thank you for consideration of our comments.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Leslie S. Lenhardt
Staff Attorney

cc: Jason Crowley
Dear Mr. Cronin,

Please forward this to Walter Sewell, as Chair of the Board of Zoning Appeals:

My husband and I have been made aware of Variance #175 and we are very much against it. We feel that this variance encroachment would dramatically affect the wildlife environment near the Raquet Club and the surrounding houses, and provide unneeded congestion and disruption in that area.

We strongly believe that no more congregate housing development should be allowed on Seabrook Island. Individual houses on more than .20 acres seems reasonable, but we seem to be getting to a critical mass with the amount of people on our beautiful island. It is a strain on many resources, and is simply not needed.

I would much prefer that somehow this property be bought by either the Town or SIPOA and remain open space for all to enjoy. Perhaps a park or dog run would be ideal.

Thanks for you service and attention.

Best,

Cindy and Bob Leonard
1009 Crooked Oaks Lane
ATTACHMENT #17c

Correspondence from SIPOA
(1 Message Received)
June 29, 2021

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

Re:  Marshwalk Trace / New Multi-Family Construction – TOSI BZA Variance Request

Dear Mr. Cronin:

It is my understanding that a variance request has been submitted to the Town of Seabrook Island Board of Zoning Appeals relating to a proposed reduction in the marsh setbacks and 50’ buffer along the property line shared with the tennis Courts. This situation is similar to that of the Salt Marsh community currently under development on Landfall Way in that the SIPOA ARC only reviews / approves the design of the units based upon the aesthetics, compliance with the SIPOA Policies and Procedures, and how it “fits” with the neighboring properties rather than the site related elements including, but not limited to the actual placement of the structure and relation to setbacks. This property will only truly come under the purview of the SIPOA ARC once the construction is completed.

Please contact me if you need any additional information.

Very truly yours,

Katrina Burrell, CMCA, AMS
Director of Administration and Architectural Review

cc: Keith Murphy, Prospective Purchaser via email
Marshwood, LLC via email
Marshwalk Trace (Master File)
ATTACHMENT #17d

Correspondence by Board of Zoning Appeals Members
(6 Messages Received)
Joe Cronin

From: Walter Sewell <wsecondwind@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 2:26 PM
To: Joe Cronin
Cc: John Fox; Bob Leggett; 'Janet Gorski'; Tom Pinckney
Subject: Marsh Walk - Drainage Easement

Joe,

I walked as much of the site associated with Variance Request No. 175, as practical, on Saturday morning about 9:00, around the time of high tide. It was obvious that the water behind the proposed most northerly building is tidal and I confirmed that by stopping by again about 3:00 that afternoon to see that all of the tidal water was gone.

The south end of the parcel of land abuts the ROW of Long Bend Drive just west of the entrance to the Racquet Club. Immediately east of the property line, as shown on the SITE PLAN CONCEPT on page 23, there is a dimension of 45 feet and it is labeled DRAINAGE EASEMENT. I looked at that location on Saturday morning, Saturday afternoon and again this morning about 10:00 and I still can’t tell whether it is tidal or not.

Also, is the Lagoon [Keynote 6 on page 23] intended to be tidal? On page 24 the lagoon is labeled STORMWATER POND with a note that says STORMWATER DIKE TO BE REPAIRED. I would assume that if the dike is repaired, the pond would be completely enclosed and would cease to be tidal on a regular basis.

So my two questions are:

Is the south end of the drainage easement tidal?

Is the stormwater pond aka lagoon intended to be tidal after it has been repaired and if so, how will that work and for what purpose?

Thanks,
Walter
Joe Cronin

From: Walter Sewell <wsecondwind@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 17, 2021 2:32 PM
To: Joe Cronin
Cc: John Fox; Bob Leggett; 'Janet Gorski'; Tom Pinckney; Ray Hoover
Subject: Drainage Easement and Stormwater Pond - Round II

Joe,

I was at a social event on Wednesday evening with Ray Hoover, President of the SIPOA Board, and it occurred to me that as a Professional Architect, somewhat close to my age, he might have some insight, as regards the 40-year old storm drains in and adjacent to the Racquet Club Villas as they might relate to the proposed development at Marsh Walk.

We timed our visit to coincide with Low Tide on Saturday morning which was at about 8:00 AM. Here are the significant findings from that site visit.

1. All of the storm drainage associated with the Racquet Club Villas and the much more recently built Charleston Town Homes, that back up to a bulkheaded lagoon, drain into the marsh behind the Racquet Club Villas. We did not find the outfall, but we are certain that the stormwater is being piped to the section of marsh between the Racquet Club Villas and the Marsh Walk Villas.
2. We visited the stormwater pond around the time of Low Tide and found the water level to be the same as it was when I visited the pond at the time of High Tide, so we’re certain that the pond is not tidal.
3. We were able to walk along the top of the dike and reach the point where the dike has been cut through at some point in the past for some reason, which is not obvious. We were able to clearly see that the large diameter concrete pipe that is set in the dike does not cross the marsh. As such, my theory that the pipe crossed the marsh and was blocking the flow of tidal water was totally wrong. There is no pipe that crosses the marsh and would interfere with tidal flow.
4. From the point where the dike is cut through, looking south toward Long Bend Drive, we could see where the tall marsh grasses ended and from there, south to Long Bend Drive there are no grasses. The entire length seems to consist of stagnant water of a bad color and a bad smell – not the smell we would associate with sewage but with that of decomposing organic material.

So, at this point I can say that all of my original questions have been answered but we still do not know why there is no tidal flow in the marsh, south of the stormwater pond.
What Ray and I agreed on is that if it is feasible to restore tidal flow to this “creek,” the ideal time to do it would be in conjunction with the proposed development, if approved.

Given that Steve Hirsh is in charge of General Operations and Maintenance for the SIPOA and can be thought of as “Mr. Drainage,” Ray agreed to speak to Heather Paton and request that Steve listen in on our Zoom Hearing on Friday, July 30th at 2:30, so he can hear first hand what is being proposed.

Now that I’ve emptied my head, I’m going to leave for Ohio. I will return at some time on the afternoon of Thursday the 29th. If there are additional materials associated with the Hearing on the 30th, please run me a copy and I’ll pick it up on Thursday afternoon, if I’m able, or early Friday morning if I’m running late on Thursday.

Walter
Joe Cronin

From: Robert Leggett <rmlegg8@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 17, 2021 6:09 PM
To: Walter Sewell
Cc: Joe Cronin; John Fox; Janet Gorski; Tom Pinckney; Ray Hoover
Subject: Re: Drainage Easement and Stormwater Pond - Round II

One additional question: has anyone ever requested approval for construction on this property, or was the first attempt?
Bob

On Sat, Jul 17, 2021, 2:31 PM Walter Sewell <wsecondwind@yahoo.com> wrote:

Joe,

I was at a social event on Wednesday evening with Ray Hoover, President of the SIPOA Board, and it occurred to me that as a Professional Architect, somewhat close to my age, he might have some insight, as regards the 40-year old storm drains in and adjacent to the Racquet Club Villas as they might relate to the proposed development at Marsh Walk.

We timed our visit to coincide with Low Tide on Saturday morning which was at about 8:00 AM. Here are the significant findings from that site visit.

1. All of the storm drainage associated with the Racquet Club Villas and the much more recently built Charleston Town Homes, that back up to a bulkheaded lagoon, drain into the marsh behind the Racquet Club Villas. We did not find the outfall, but we are certain that the stormwater is being piped to the section of marsh between the Racquet Club Villas and the Marsh Walk Villas.
2. We visited the stormwater pond around the time of Low Tide and found the water level to be the same as it was when I visited the pond at the time of High Tide, so we’re certain that the pond is not tidal.
3. We were able to walk along the top of the dike and reach the point where the dike has been cut through at some point in the past for some reason, which is not obvious. We were able to clearly see that the large diameter concrete pipe that is set in the dike does not cross the marsh. As such, my theory that the pipe crossed the marsh and was blocking the flow of tidal water was totally wrong. There is no pipe that crosses the marsh and would interfere with tidal flow.
4. From the point where the dike is cut through, looking south toward Long Bend Drive, we could see where the tall marsh grasses ended and from there, south to Long Bend Drive there are no grasses. The entire length seems to consist of stagnant water of a bad color and a bad smell – not the smell we would associate with sewage but with that of decomposing organic material.

So, at this point I can say that all of my original questions have been answered but we still do not know why there is no tidal flow in the marsh, south of the stormwater pond.
What Ray and I agreed on is that if it is feasible to restore tidal flow to this “creek,” the ideal time to do it would be in conjunction with the proposed development, if approved.

Given that Steve Hirsh is in charge of General Operations and Maintenance for the SIPOA and can be thought of as “Mr. Drainage,” Ray agreed to speak to Heather Paton and request that Steve listen in on our Zoom Hearing on Friday, July 30th at 2:30, so he can hear first hand what is being proposed.

Now that I’ve emptied my head, I’m going to leave for Ohio. I will return at some time on the afternoon of Thursday the 29th. If there are additional materials associated with the Hearing on the 30th, please run me a copy and I’ll pick it up on Thursday afternoon, if I’m able, or early Friday morning if I’m running late on Thursday.

Walter
Joe Cronin

From: Walter Sewell <wsecondwind@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 17, 2021 7:08 PM
To: 'Robert Leggett'
Cc: Joe Cronin; 'John Fox'; 'Janet Gorski'; 'Tom Pinckney'; 'Ray Hoover'
Subject: RE: Drainage Easement and Stormwater Pond - Round II

I have no idea but I’m going into this assuming that it’s brand new.
What I find most interesting is that this is the first new development that the BZA has had to deal with since I went on the Board in early 2014.

From: Robert Leggett <rmlegg8@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 17, 2021 6:09 PM
To: Walter Sewell <wsecondwind@yahoo.com>
Cc: Joseph M. Cronin <jcronin@townofseabrookisland.org>; John Fox <johnfox8624@gmail.com>; Janet Gorski <gorskijw@gmail.com>; Tom Pinckney <pinckney.tom@comcast.net>; Ray Hoover <rayhooverfaia@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Drainage Easement and Stormwater Pond - Round II

One additional question: has anyone ever requested approval for construction on this property, or us the first attempt? Bob

On Sat, Jul 17, 2021, 2:31 PM Walter Sewell <wsecondwind@yahoo.com> wrote:

Joe,

I was at a social event on Wednesday evening with Ray Hoover, President of the SIPOA Board, and it occurred to me that as a Professional Architect, somewhat close to my age, he might have some insight, as regards the 40-year old storm drains in and adjacent to the Racquet Club Villas as they might relate to the proposed development at Marsh Walk.

We timed our visit to coincide with Low Tide on Saturday morning which was at about 8:00 AM. Here are the significant findings from that site visit.

1. All of the storm drainage associated with the Racquet Club Villas and the much more recently built Charleston Town Homes, that back up to a bulkheaded lagoon, drain into the marsh behind the Racquet Club Villas. We did not find the outfall, but we are certain that the stormwater is being piped to the section of marsh between the Racquet Club Villas and the Marsh Walk Villas.
2. We visited the stormwater pond around the time of Low Tide and found the water level to be the same as it was when I visited the pond at the time of High Tide, so we’re certain that the pond is not tidal.
3. We were able to walk along the top of the dike and reach the point where the dike has been cut through at some point in the past for some reason, which is not obvious. We were able to clearly see that the large diameter concrete pipe that is set in the dike does not cross the marsh. As such, my theory that the pipe
crossed the marsh and was blocking the flow of tidal water was totally wrong. There is no pipe that crosses the marsh and would interfere with tidal flow.

4. From the point where the dike is cut through, looking south toward Long Bend Drive, we could see where the tall marsh grasses ended and from there, south to Long Bend Drive there are no grasses. The entire length seems to consist of stagnant water of a bad color and a bad smell – not the smell we would associate with sewage but with that of decomposing organic material.

So, at this point I can say that all of my original questions have been answered but we still do not know why there is no tidal flow in the marsh, south of the stormwater pond.

What Ray and I agreed on is that if it is feasible to restore tidal flow to this “creek,” the ideal time to do it would be in conjunction with the proposed development, if approved.

Given that Steve Hirsh is in charge of General Operations and Maintenance for the SIPOA and can be thought of as “Mr. Drainage,” Ray agreed to speak to Heather Paton and request that Steve listen in on our Zoom Hearing on Friday, July 30th at 2:30, so he can hear first hand what is being proposed.

Now that I’ve emptied my head, I’m going to leave for Ohio. I will return at some time on the afternoon of Thursday the 29th. If there are additional materials associated with the Hearing on the 30th, please run me a copy and I’ll pick it up on Thursday afternoon, if I’m able, or early Friday morning if I’m running late on Thursday.

Walter
Bob,

I had the same question. Hopefully, Joe can review this history on this property and let us know.

Janet

On Sat, 17 Jul 2021, 6:09 pm Robert Leggett, <rmlegg8@gmail.com> wrote:
One additional question: has anyone ever requested approval for construction on this property, or us the first attempt?
Bob

On Sat, Jul 17, 2021, 2:31 PM Walter Sewell <wsecondwind@yahoo.com> wrote:

Joe,

I was at a social event on Wednesday evening with Ray Hoover, President of the SIPOA Board, and it occurred to me that as a Professional Architect, somewhat close to my age, he might have some insight, as regards the 40-year old storm drains in and adjacent to the Racquet Club Villas as they might relate to the proposed development at Marsh Walk.

We timed our visit to coincide with Low Tide on Saturday morning which was at about 8:00 AM. Here are the significant findings from that site visit.

1. All of the storm drainage associated with the Racquet Club Villas and the much more recently built Charleston Town Homes, that back up to a bulkheaded lagoon, drain into the marsh behind the Racquet Club Villas. We did not find the outfall, but we are certain that the stormwater is being piped to the section of marsh between the Racquet Club Villas and the Marsh Walk Villas.
2. We visited the stormwater pond around the time of Low Tide and found the water level to be the same as it was when I visited the pond at the time of High Tide, so we’re certain that the pond is not tidal.
3. We were able to walk along the top of the dike and reach the point where the dike has been cut through at some point in the past for some reason, which is not obvious. We were able to clearly see that the large diameter concrete pipe that is set in the dike does not cross the marsh. As such, my theory that the pipe crossed the marsh and was blocking the flow of tidal water was totally wrong. There is no pipe that crosses the marsh and would interfere with tidal flow.
4. From the point where the dike is cut through, looking south toward Long Bend Drive, we could see where the tall marsh grasses ended and from there, south to Long Bend Drive there are no grasses. The entire length
seems to consist of stagnant water of a bad color and a bad smell – not the smell we would associate with sewage but with that of decomposing organic material.

So, at this point I can say that all of my original questions have been answered but we still do not know why there is no tidal flow in the marsh, south of the stormwater pond.

What Ray and I agreed on is that if it is feasible to restore tidal flow to this “creek,” the ideal time to do it would be in conjunction with the proposed development, if approved.

Given that Steve Hirsh is in charge of General Operations and Maintenance for the S IPOA and can be thought of as “Mr. Drainage,” Ray agreed to speak to Heather Paton and request that Steve listen in on our Zoom Hearing on Friday, July 30th at 2:30, so he can hear first hand what is being proposed.

Now that I've emptied my head, I’m going to leave for Ohio. I will return at some time on the afternoon of Thursday the 29th. If there are additional materials associated with the Hearing on the 30th, please run me a copy and I’ll pick it up on Thursday afternoon, if I’m able, or early Friday morning if I’m running late on Thursday.

Walter
Joe

I would be interested to know the Dr washing behind the 50 foot buffer at tennis courts and if this is still included in the new DSO yet to be voted on. Could you include this info in the packet or just have the info avail to answer my question at the meeting.

Thanks
John
### Table 11-3, BUFFER Zones Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Districts</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>CSC</th>
<th>RTH</th>
<th>RMF</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>Non-Res&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-SF1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-SF2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-SF3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-SFV</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-CL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-TH</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-MF</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Where a BUFFER or trees and vegetation exist within the required BUFFER area, the existing trees and vegetation may count toward meeting the BUFFER requirements of this section and shall be supplemented, as needed, to fully comply with the requirements shown in Table 11-3a, BUFFER Zone Specifications.

### Table 11-3a, BUFFER Zone Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>BUFFER Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum depth (ft.)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy trees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental trees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen trees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRUBs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>20</sup> Non-residential uses within a residential zoning district.

<sup>21</sup> Number required per 100 linear feet of BUFFER, as measured along the property line. The reviewing authority may allow the substitution of tall grasses for shrubs when it is determined that the visual affect will be comparable.
According to that sometimes-accurate source, Nextdoor, there were plans for a 4th Marsh Walk building. To quote “When that fell through, the original developer of Marsh Walk sold it off. This proposal is not the first one for the parcel since it was sold. I do think it is the first one asking for a variance on the setbacks.”

Joe- does your research confirm the above?

Thanks, Bob

I had the same question. Hopefully, Joe can review this history on this property and let us know.

Janet

On Sat, 17 Jul 2021, 6:09 pm Robert Leggett, <rmlegg8@gmail.com> wrote:

One additional question: has anyone ever requested approval for construction on this property, or is this the first attempt? Bob