TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND

Planning Commission Special Called Meeting July 18, 2018 – 1:30 PM

Town Hall, Council Chambers 2001 Seabrook Island Road



MINUTES

Present: Robert Driscoll (Chair), Cathy Patterson, Wayne Billian, Ken Otstot, Joe Cronin (Town

Administrator)

Absent: Lori Leary

Guests: Dan Frazier (Charleston County), Andrea Pietras (Charleston County), Rachel Burton

(Swallowtail Architecture), Ray Pantlik (Atlantic Partners II LLC), Mark Permar (Permar

Inc.), Richard Ackerman (Big Rock Partners LLC), Katrina Burrell (SIPOA)

Chairman Driscoll called the meeting to order at 1:39 pm. Town Administrator Cronin confirmed that the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were fulfilled, and the meeting agenda was properly posted.

OLD BUSINESS ITEMS

There were no Old Business Items.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Architectural Review: The Village at Seabrook (Swallowtail 1): Town Administrator Cronin provided a brief overview of the request, the purpose of which was to review and approve a new single-family home elevation for use in the Village at Seabrook. Town Administrator Cronin stated that the proposed "Swallowtail 1" model, which was prepared by Rachel Burton of Swallowtail Architecture, had been reviewed and approved by both the Village at Seabrook Regime Board, as well as the SIPOA Architectural Review Committee. Town staff recommended in favor of approval.

Ms. Patterson stated that she was the president of the Village at Seabrook Board and, therefore, would be recusing herself from voting on this item. (See attached recusal statement.)

Mr. Otstot made a motion to approve the Swallowtail 1 model, as submitted. Chairman Driscoll seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 2-0, with Ms. Patterson recusing.

2. Temporary Use Permit: 2018 Alan Fleming Tennis Tournament: Town Administrator Cronin provided a brief overview of the request, the purpose of which was to review and provide a recommendation to Town Council on a temporary use permit request for the 2018 Alan Fleming Tennis Tournament. Town Administrator Cronin stated that the event would take place from October 2-7 at the Seabrook Island Racquet Club (1701 Long Bend Drive). The applicants were requesting approval to place a 20' x 30' tent on the property, as well as three temporary banner signs. Mr. Otstot made a motion to recommend in favor of granting the temporary use permit. Ms. Patterson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 3-0.

Mr. Billian joined the meeting at 2:00 pm.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

1. Seabrook Island Road Encroachment Permit Request: Town Administrator Cronin stated that the town had received an encroachment permit application from Atlantic Partners II LLC to install a driveway connection on Seabrook Island Road. The driveway was proposed to be located between the traffic circle and the former Miss Lulu's and would serve a future senior living facility adjacent to Freshfields Village. He stated that the town's Development Standards Ordinance places approval authority for encroachment permits under the Planning Commission's purview, and that any appeals of the Planning Commission's decision would be made to Town Council for a de novo review.

Ray Pantlik of Atlantic Partners II LLC was asked to provide a brief overview of the request. Mr. Pantlik introduced himself, as well as Mark Permar of Permar Inc., and Richard Ackerman of Big Rock Partners LLC. Mr. Pantlik stated that Atlantic Partners II LLC was the current owner of the property, and that Big Rock Partners LLC would develop the facility. Mr. Pantlik stated that, in consultation with town staff, and as a requirement of the town's ordinance, a traffic impact analysis (TIA) was completed by the engineering firm of Thomas & Hutton during the week of Memorial Day. The TIA found that the anticipated traffic volumes related to the facility (daily: 632 trips; hourly: 16 AM peak enter, 20 AM peak exit, 24 PM peak enter and 24 PM peak exit) would result in no degradation to the existing level of service on Seabrook Island Road. The study also determined that no off-site improvements were warranted based on current and projected traffic volumes, inclusive of an assumed background growth of 1% per year.

Mr. Permar provided a brief history of the Freshfields project and discussed the existing entitlements under the Freshfields PUD. He stated that the PUD allows up to 480,000 square feet of commercial development, up to 100 hotel rooms and up to 200 dwelling units. To date, 227,500 square feet of commercial development has been built by (or committed to) Northwoods for Freshfields Village, and 100 rooms/72,500 square feet of commercial has been committed for the Andell Inn. This leaves Atlantic Partners II LLC with 180,000 square feet of commercial entitlements, as well as 200 dwelling units. As part of the proposed senior living project, the developer is seeking to construct a continuing care retirement community (CCRC) with independent living units, assisted living units, and memory care beds.

Chairman Driscoll asked who holds the residual entitlements. Mr. Permar responded that Atlantic Partners II LLC holds the residual entitlements, including any remaining commercial square footage and residential dwelling units. Chairman Driscoll then asked what the plans were for the remaining property between the proposed senior facility and the lake. Mr. Permar responded that there were no current plans, but that residential units would be the most probable use.

Mr. Billian asked if it would be possible to access the senior facility across the lake, rather than via a new curb cut on Seabrook Island Road. Mr. Permar responded that connecting a road across the lake would be difficult, but that there was potential for a pedestrian bridge.

Mr. Permar provided a brief overview of the conceptual designs for the site plan and building. He then introduced Richard Ackerman of Big Rock Partners LLC.

Mr. Ackerman introduced himself and his company to members of the Planning Commission. He stated that Big Rock is based in Delray Beach, FL, and Beverly Hills, CA, and has built two similar CCRC's, including the Windsor at Celebration project in the Disney master-planned community of Celebration, FL. He stated that the project would include independent living apartments, assisted living, and memory care units (which would be fully secured with a full-time staff). He added that Big Rock emphasizes socialization and interaction among residents by focusing on amenities such as food, technology, fitness and entertainment. He added that, unlike most facilities, their communities are not designed to be institutional in nature. He also stated that lowa-based Life Care Services would manage the facility.

Chairman Driscoll asked if someone could speak to the operations and staffing of the facility. Mr. Ackerman responded that the facility would have approximately 100 employees, adding that they would work in shifts, so not all 100 would be coming and going at the same time. There are expected to be three shifts for nurses and two shifts for kitchen and wait staff. Administrative, sales and HR staff would generally keep a 9:00-5:00 schedule, while housekeeping staff would be present six days per week. There would be additional staff for drivers and security. He noted that independent living, which made up the largest component of the project, was not staff intensive.

Chairman Driscoll asked how medical treatment would be provided at the facility. Mr. Ackerman responded that there would be nursing staff on site, but not emergency medical services. These would be provided by Charleston County EMS. Chairman Driscoll followed up by asking if Seabrook Island Road would be the probable access point for emergency vehicles. Mr. Ackerman responded that this would be up to the ambulance drivers, but that it was likely given that Seabrook Island Road would be the shortest and most direct route.

Ms. Patterson asked how the facility would be promoted. Mr. Ackerman responded that there are no other senior facilities between Kiawah Island and Hilton Head Island, and that there was only one other facility between Charleston and Kiawah Island. He added that they were anticipating up to 80% of their residents would be residents of Seabrook Island and Kiawah Island, or parents of town residents.

Chairman Driscoll asked for the total amount of impervious area. Mr. Permar responded that he wasn't sure of the pervious and impervious calculations, but that he would obtain that information and share it with members of the Planning Commission.

Chairman Driscoll asked about the stormwater drainage plans, adding that he was concerned about potential impact to Seabrook Island Road. Mr. Permar responded that the plans called for stormwater to flow to the existing lake behind the property. He added that the pond was sized for 20% more than what was entitled for Freshfields Village and the neighboring Haulover Creek development. Mr. Pantlik stated that the site development plans were submitted to SCDHEC yesterday for NPDES permitting. Mr. Pantlik also noted that all water would flow southward away from Seabrook Island Road, first to the existing lake, and then across drainage easements before entering Brick Creek.

Ms. Patterson asked who would be providing sewer service to the property. Mr. Pantlik responded that sewer service would be provided by the Seabrook Island Utility Commission, as part of a previous agreement.

Mr. Billian asked why the site plan did not include turn lanes on Seabrook Island Road. Mr. Pantlik responded that the TIA showed that turn lanes weren't warranted due to current volumes, as well as projected impact from the new facility.

Chairman Driscoll noted that traffic turning left into the property would cross a bike and pedestrian pathway. In addition to creating safety concerns, this would also slow left turning traffic.

Mr. Billian asked whether the property would be connected internally to the remainder of Freshfields Village. Mr. Permar responded that there would be an internal road connection between the property and Freshfields Village. This connection was proposed to help traffic flow between the two properties. Town Administrator Cronin noted that from a planning standpoint, an internal connection point was preferable as it would eliminate the need for traffic moving between the senior facility and Freshfields to use Seabrook Island Road. Mr. Billian stated that this connection could also invite more cut-through traffic from Seabrook Island residents.

Ms. Patterson mentioned the frequent road closures in Freshfields due to concerts, festivals and other events. She too had concerns about this access point serving as a cut through.

Mayor Ciancio, who was in the audience, stated that while senior housing is a preferable use from a traffic standpoint, it doesn't benefit the residents of Seabrook Island.

Chairman Driscoll asked whether there would be any impact to existing utilities located along Seabrook Island Road. Mr. Pantlik responded that there is an existing utility easement that runs parallel to Seabrook Island Road. Therefore, no utilities would need to be relocated or disturbed.

Mr. Otstot asked what the timeframe would be for construction of the facility. Mr. Ackerman responded that it would take approximately 22 months to complete construction. Mr. Otstot then asked whether construction vehicles and equipment could access the property from an alternate location. Mr. Pantlik noted that the only other option for construction access would be through Freshfields, as the property owner does not have any easement rights across neighboring property.

Town Administrator Cronin noted that Atlantic Partners II also owns property on the other side of Seabrook Island Road. He stated that if that property were ever developed, the town would expect a future driveway to line up with the one proposed for the senior facility. He asked if this was feasible. Mr. Permar responded that there were no immediate plans to develop the property on the other side of the street; however, if it were developed in the future, then access to that property could be provided at the same location.

Town Administrator Cronin asked how far the building would be set back from Seabrook Island Road. Mr. Pantlik stated that Berkeley Electric Coop has a 30' easement running parallel to the 66' road right-of-way, so the building and internal roads would be at set back at least 30' from the right-of-way.

Town Administrator Cronin asked how tall the building would be. A member of the design team stated that the building would be approximately 42' tall, containing three residential floors over parking.

Town Administrator Cronin asked if there were any cross-access easements with the neighboring Haulover Creek property. Mr. Pantlik responded that there were no existing easements. Town Administrator Cronin noted that these types of connections would be beneficial, as it would allow for better connectivity between properties and reduce future traffic impact to Seabrook Island Road.

Mr. Pantlik thanked members of the Planning Commission for the opportunity to present. He added that the encroachment permit application has been submitted to the town for the Planning Commission's consideration at their August meeting.

2. Material Requirements for Walls and Fences: Town Administrator Cronin stated that he was recently made aware of a conflict between the town's zoning requirements and the SIPOA's guidelines regarding allowable materials for retaining walls and fences. He stated that the town's ordinance requires walls and fences to be made of stucco, cypress, pressure treated wood and similar materials, whereas the SIPOA allows the use of architectural concrete masonry units (CMU) for retaining walls and powder coated aluminum for fencing. He noted that while the zoning ordinance prohibits architectural CMU and aluminum, he has seen several instances of both materials being used while driving around the island. He recommended amending the zoning ordinance to bring the town's material requirements in line with those of the SIPOA. Members of the Planning Commission agreed that it would be beneficial to eliminate this conflict and asked Town Administrator Cronin to bring back a draft text amendment for review.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN WORK SESSION

- 1. <u>Draft Survey Questions</u>: Dan Frazier and Andrea Pietras from the Charleston County Planning Department reviewed the draft community survey with members of the Planning Commission. Commission members discussed possible modifications to the survey questions, as well as methods for obtaining feedback from non-resident visitors. Town Administrator Cronin stated that he was hoping to have the survey link active on the town's website by the first week of August, and that survey collection would run until the end of August.
- 2. <u>Stakeholder Meeting Invitees</u>: Town Administrator Cronin stated that town and county staff would be compiling a list of individuals and groups to invite to the stakeholder meetings. A draft list will be forwarded to Planning Commission members for review and comment prior to invitations going out.
- 3. Project Schedule: Mr. Frazier distributed a revised project schedule for the comprehensive plan update. Mr. Frazier stated that the Planning Commission's decision to hold comprehensive plan workshops during its regular meetings, rather than separate work sessions, necessitated a minor shift to the schedule to allow time for data collection. Mr. Frazier added that the original schedule allowed sufficient time to accommodate minor revisions, and that the project was still anticipated to be completed prior to July 2019.

There being no further business, Mr. Billian made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Chairman Driscoll seconded the motion. The vote in favor of the motion was 4-0, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:12 pm.

Minutes Approved: September 26, 2018

Joseph M. Cronin Town Administrator



TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND

2001 Seabrook Island Road Seabrook Island, SC 29455

RECUSAL STATEMENT Member Name: Planning Commission Public Body: ☐ Board of Zoning Appeals ☐ Town Council ☐ ATAX Advisory Comm. ☐ Utilities Commission ☐ Ways & Means Comm. ☐ Other: Meeting Date: Agenda Item: Agenda Topic: The Ethics Act, SC Code §8-13-700, provides that no public official may knowingly use his office to obtain an economic interest for himself, a family member of his immediate family, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business with which he is associated. No public official may make, participate in making, or influence a governmental decision in which he or any such person or business has an economic interest. Failure to recuse oneself from an issue in which there is or may be conflict of interest is the sole responsibility of the elected or appointed official (1991 Op. Atty. Gen. No. 91-37.) A written statement describing the matter requiring action and the nature of the potential conflict of interest is required. Justification to Recuse: ☐ Professionally employed by or under contract with principal ☐ Owns or has vested interest in principal or property Other: 7-15-2018 Date Member Signature Received by Presiding Officer:

Presiding Officer Signature