

# ATTACHMENT #17-B

# **SUPPLEMENT**

Correspondence in Opposition to the Variance Request (5 Messages Received)

You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments -Variance #176. Mark as Spam

## Submitted Information:

**Name** Julie McCulloch

Address 3075 Marsh Gate Drive

**Email Address** 

**Do you support the approval of Variance #176?** No - Opposed

#### Comment

I do not believe this variance should be approved for a number of reasons: 1) Although proposal is to move the house back to the OCRM line (vs. having a 30'ft. Setback), this would still go against what the change in OCRM line was intended to do - prohibit building in sensitive coastal areas. 2) granting a 4' encroachment in the front setback line would be egregious. Maybe a few inches, yes, but 4 feet? If this is approved, it will be difficult to deny other potential home builders the right to "re-size" the property to fit their plans. You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments -Variance #176. Mark as Spam

# **Submitted Information:**

**Name** Ron Calhoun

Address 3565 Seabrook island rd

Email Address calhounron@hotmail.com

**Do you support the approval of Variance #176?** No - Opposed

**Comment** Too big for lot. no-reply@weebly.com Joe Cronin New Form Entry: Public Comments - Variance #176 Thursday, September 9, 2021 5:07:54 AM

You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments -Variance #176. Mark as Spam

### **Submitted Information:**

Name Megan Sniecinski

Address 2465 The Haul Over

Email Address Megan.sniecinski@gmail.com

**Do you support the approval of Variance #176?** No - Opposed

#### Comment

I oppose approval. The small irregular shape of the lot is not conducive for the size of proposed home and we should not make an exception for the rear setback. It puts our natural habitat and seafront wall at risk and runs risk of setting a precedent for further variance requests pushing limits that were previously established in best interests of our community. no-reply@weebly.com Joe Cronin New Form Entry: Public Comments - Variance #176 Thursday, September 9, 2021 7:54:02 AM

You've just received a new submission to your Public Comments -Variance #176. Mark as Spam

### **Submitted Information:**

Name Anne and Rob Bavier

Address 3132 Privateer Creek Road

Email Address Bavier85@gmail.com

**Do you support the approval of Variance #176?** No - Opposed

#### Comment

We have been coming to Seabrook since the 1970s and retired here because the community consistently preserved the dunes and beachfront restrictions. The proposed variant must be declined to protect the beach and maintain the setbacks that make this a lovely place for all. The proposed changes are not necessary as ordinances provide ample space to create a lovely residence.

## Joe Cronin

From:	Karen England-Barnola <kengland.barnola@gmail.com></kengland.barnola@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, September 9, 2021 10:37 AM
То:	Joe Cronin
Subject:	Variance request 3764 SIR

Joe,

My response to this variance request is a resounding NO!

We are grateful for our dunes, they are basically our only protection from the higher water levels due to climate change. Building in or near to them not only endangers humans, but changes habitats for the marine life and sea turtles of SI. If you have been to North Beach or South beach, you have to be aware of the damaging sea encroachment.

In addition, building so close to SI road is unthinkable of the effects on the roadway, a future of requirements of substantial repairs because of dune collapse. The property owner of this property knew about this variance when they bought the property, they have received very bad advice, or they have no clue about living in a barrier island.

Thank you Joe for your assistance with protecting our homes in paradise.

Regards, Karen Barnola 3113 Seabrook Island Rd

Sent from my iPhone