CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Special Called Meeting: July 18, 2018 [Pages 3–9]
2. Special Called Meeting: August 15, 2018 [Pages 10–18]

OLD BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Architectural Review: SI Club Equestrian Center Expansion (Amended) [Pages 19–58]
   Request from the Seabrook Island Club to approve amendments to proposed modifications to the existing Equestrian Center barn located at 2313 Seabrook Island Road

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

   Request from the Seabrook Island Property Owners Association to approve construction of a proposed storage building at 2832 Seabrook Island Road
2. Text Amendment: Requirements for Walls and Fences [Pages 86–90]
   An ordinance amending the Development Standards Ordinance of the Town of Seabrook Island, South Carolina; Article 10, Buffers, Landscaping and Tree Protection; Section 10.60, Specifications for Walls, Fences and Hedges; so as to amend the general requirements for walls and fences

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

1. Discussion of meeting format and voting procedure regarding the pending encroachment permit application
2. **Upcoming Meeting Dates**

ADJOURN
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 Iowa-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.
1. **Draft Survey Questions**: 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. **Stakeholder Meeting Invitees**: 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:  
Joseph M. Cronin  
Town Administrator
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Presiding Officer Signature
TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND
Planning Commission Special Called Meeting
August 15, 2018 – 2:30 PM

Town Hall, Council Chambers
2001 Seabrook Island Road

MINUTES

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

Absent: None

Guests: Mayor Ron Ciancio, Councilman John Gregg, Councilwoman Jeri Finke, Jim Bannwart (Utility Commission), Tommy West (Utility Commission), Heather Paton (SIPOA), Stephanie Tillerson (Town of Kiawah Island), John Taylor (Town of Kiawah Island), Ray Pantlik (Atlantic Partners II LLC), Mark Permar (Permar Inc.), Richard Ackerman (Big Rock Partners LLC), Jordan Phillips (Atlantic Partners II LLC), Tony Woody (Thomas & Hutton), Paul Ford (Reveer Group), Bob George (G. Robert George & Associates), Janet Pasquale (Resident)

Chairman Driscoll called the meeting to order at 2:30 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. Rezoning Request: 2460 Seabrook Island Road: Town Administrator Cronin provided a brief overview of the request, the purpose of which was to review and provide a recommendation on a rezoning request from the Seabrook Island Property Owners Association (SIPOA) for Charleston County Tax Map Number 147-02-00-020, containing approximately 0.54 +/- acres located at 2460 Seabrook Island Road. The SIPOA requested a rezoning of the property from the SR Single-Family Residential District to the AGC Agricultural-Conservation District. Town Administrator Cronin indicated that town staff recommended in favor of approving the rezoning request.

Ms. Patterson made a motion to recommend in favor of approving the rezoning request from SR to AGC. Ms. Leary seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-0.
2. **Encroachment Permit Request: Kiawah Senior Living Facility:** Chairman Driscoll began discussion of this item by providing an overview of Seabrook Island Road. He stated that the town owns a 66’ right-of-way easement, which was previously annexed into the town limits, and that the town has the power to regulate access to the road through the issuance of encroachment permits. He stated that under the town’s Development Standards Ordinance (DSO), encroachment permit applications are reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission, and that an applicant may appeal a decision to Town Council for de novo review. He explained that the Planning Commission can approve, approve with conditions, or deny any encroachment permit application, adding that denial can only be for legitimate, supported decisions, and not for arbitrary reasons. Chairman Driscoll then outlined the process for consideration of the request, beginning with a presentation by the applicant, dialogue between the applicant and Planning Commission members, the receipt of information from outside advisors (including transportation and stormwater consultants, as well as the SIUC) and receipt of public comments.

Chairman Driscoll called on Ray Pantlik, Director of Development for Kiawah Partners/Atlantic Partners II, LLC. Mr. Pantlik provided an overview of the application. He also detailed changes from the preliminary designs and traffic impact analysis (TIA) which were presented to the Planning Commission in July. Mr. Pantlik noted that while the TIA found that a left turn lane from Seabrook Island Road into the property was not warranted based on current and projected turn volumes, the applicants included a left turn lane at the town’s request.

Tony Woody of Thomas and Hutton also spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Woody provided additional information regarding the TIA. Mr. Woody stated that traffic counts were conducted during Memorial Day week. Thomas and Hutton conducted a 24-hour count to identify peak hour traffic volumes, then added background growth and projected traffic volumes from the new facility to determine what improvements, if any, were necessary. Responding to recommendations from the town’s outside transportation engineer, the Reveer Group, Mr. Woody stated that in designing the new intersection, the engineers were trying to be sensitive to the existing tree cover along Seabrook Island Road, but added that the applicants could provide 150’ of storage capacity and extend the taper lengths if that was what the town wanted. He added that the SCDOT allows judgement at the local level regarding site distance and tree removal, using Bohicket Road as an example. But he added, again, that the applicants could modify their plans to remove additional trees if that was what the town desired. Mr. Woody stated that Thomas and Hutton had also run an analysis of what would happen at the traffic circle if a second access was not provided from Seabrook Island Road to the site. He stated that the projected impact in the circle would be an additional 2 second delay in the AM peak hour, and an additional 1 second delay in the PM peak hour. There would be no change in the overall Level of Service (LOS); however, the LOS at the Betsy Kerrison Pkwy approach, which is the primary turning movement, would decrease from a LOS D to LOS E during the AM peak hour.

Chairman Driscoll asked if these impacts were enough to rule out using the traffic circle, via Freshfields Village, as the primary point of access to the site. Mr. Woody responded that the additional 2 second delay would be in addition to any background growth, arguing that the
total impact would be cumulative. He also added that there would be no impact to the overall LOS at the traffic circle in the AM or PM peak hour with or without a second access point.

Chairman Driscoll asked if an additional 2 second delay would result in traffic backing up beyond the project entrance on Seabrook Island Road. Mr. Woody responded that he was unsure if that would be the case.

Chairman Driscoll noted that while the study assumed background growth from the Town of Seabrook Island, he asked whether it also included growth from Kiawah River Plantation, the Haulover Creek property, or other tracts. Mr. Woody responded that the background growth rate did not apply to any specific property or development, but rather, was a projection of overall growth rates taking place in the surrounding areas.

Chairman Driscoll asked how the background growth rate was determined. Mr. Woody responded that Thomas and Hutton used annual daily counts from SCDOT for the years 2012 through 2017 to determine an average annual growth rate. This growth rate was then added to current peak hour volumes to determine traffic impact in a build vs. no-build scenario.

Chairman Driscoll asked what guidelines were used to determine whether the project would have any storm drainage impact to the town. Mr. Woody responded that Thomas and Hutton designed the project based on SCDHEC and Charleston County requirements. He added that while the plans have not yet been finalized, the drainage capacity is more than adequate to serve the site.

Chairman Driscoll questioned if the applicants were asking the Planning Commission to rely on the engineer’s findings. Mr. Woody responded that Thomas and Hutton prepared and signed an engineered report based on SCDHEC and county guidelines. This report stated that runoff will increase as a result of the project; however, all water will be retained on-site in the lake before being dispersed from the site at pre-development conditions. Mr. Woody added that the designs meet all state and local criteria, and as-built drawings will be prepared upon completion to verify that construction was completed in accordance with the plans.

Ms. Patterson noted that the Freshfields PUD limits the total number of residential units to 200. She asked why 50 additional townhomes were added in the TIA assumptions when these would not be allowed under the existing entitlements. Mr. Pantlik responded that the current residential cap was 200 units, and that the Freshfields PUD has not been amended to allow any additional units. He added that the applicants wanted to overestimate the number of units for the purpose of projecting future traffic volumes, but that these additional townhomes were not currently permitted under the existing entitlements.

Mr. Pantlik also discussed the recommendations contained within the Reveer Group’s report. He noted that the access management criteria in the town’s DSO was pretested with the term “to the extent feasible.” He also questioned the finding in the Reveer Group’s report that if this access point was approved, no other access points would be allowed along Seabrook Island Road. He stated that this access point would not cause the revocation of any access
Chairman Driscoll asked if anyone from the applicant’s team could discuss plans for construction traffic. Mr. Pantlik responded that during the initial phase of construction (prior to completion of the road widening and installation of the left turn lane), construction traffic would enter the site through Freshfields, and would exit the site via a right-turn onto Seabrook Island Road. Once the left turn lane was completed, construction traffic would enter and exit via the new access point on Seabrook Island Road. He added that the staging area for construction equipment and materials would be located behind the senior facility site.

Chairman Driscoll asked who designed the entrance on Seabrook Island Road. Mr. Pantlik responded that Thomas and Hutton had completed the design. Chairman Driscoll noted that in the original design, the bike path was moved closer to Seabrook Island Road, whereas in the current design, it was proposed to be moved further away from the roadway. Mr. Pantlik stated that the intersection had been redesigned to improve its safety and functionality, which resulted in moving the bike path crossing further back from the right-of-way.

Ms. Patterson asked what had happened to the 50-foot buffer zone referenced in the Freshfields PUD. Mr. Pantlik responded that the buffer zone included the Berkeley Electric Coop and bike path easements, adding that no part of the site would encroach into the buffer zone, with the exception of the driveway.

Mr. Pantlik also addressed the comments from the Reveer Group’s report which recommended the removal of at least 7-8 oak trees for line-of-sight purposes. He stated that he didn’t think this would be the best approach for the roadway, but that the applicant was prepared to remove additional trees to meet the line-of-sight recommendations, if that’s what the town preferred.

Mr. Billian asked if the center line of the road could remain where it is, with the widening taking place on both sides of the center line. He added that this would allow for preservation of the symmetrical tree line along the right-of-way. Mr. Pantlik responded that the current plan to widen Seabrook Island Road on the south side would allow all drainage to flow through the site to the lake at Freshfields. He added that widening the road to the north would likely affect an OCRM critical area. Mr. Woody added that the ditch on the north side of the road is an OCRM critical area; the applicants could design an alternate widening plan, however, it was uncertain whether the state would approve that design given the feasibility of an alternate design.

Ms. Patterson expressed concern about future development on the other side of Seabrook Island Road, and specifically, what would happen in the future if the new access point for the senior facility became a full movement intersection to serve properties on both sides of the road. Mr. Pantlik responded that the majority of the property on the north side of the road is OCRM critical area or jurisdictional wetlands, and the majority of that property would likely remain undeveloped. Mr. Billian stated that the Greenspace Conservancy would be happy to
see that land donated for preservation. Mr. Pantlik said he wouldn’t go so far as to say it was totally undevelopable.

Mr. Otstot asked if it would be possible to place a stake or flag at the location of the proposed driveway. Mr. Pantlik stated that they could certainly mark the driveway. He added that the new driveway would be located approximately where the taper begins for the right-turn into the former Miss Lulu’s.

Ms. Patterson asked why a second entrance wasn’t built when Freshfields started in the early 2000’s. Mr. Pantlik responded that plans for a second access road went all the way back to the original rezoning for Freshfields. Mr. Permar added that the concept plan in the initial Freshfields PUD always included a second access point on Seabrook Island Road. Ms. Patterson then asked why the subdivision plans and plats for Freshfields have never shown a secondary access. Mr. Permar responded that Freshfields was developed in phases; while a road was always shown in the concept plan, it was not shown on site specific plans or plats because that portion of the property had not yet been subdivided or developed. It was always their plan to seek a secondary access point, as shown on the concept plan, when that portion of the property was developed. Mr. Permar then discussed the role of a concept plan and the process of developing under a multi-phased PUD, adding that while it was part of their vision, it would be up to the town’s judgment as to whether a secondary access point would be permitted. Ms. Patterson noted that Freshfields has been able to operate just fine with its existing road network.

Chairman Driscoll asked if there was any other discussion on the topics of traffic or stormwater. Mr. Pantlik commented on one additional item in the Reveer Group’s report. He added that one new drain pipe would need to be extended across existing utilities. He was confident that this could be done in coordination with utility providers in a safe manner, and without interruption to service. Chairman Driscoll asked what utilities would need to be crossed. Mr. Pantlik responded that there was an existing water main, sewer force main, and underground power.

Mr. Woody offered a parting thought that there were many good comments in the Reveer Group’s report, and that the applicant could modify the proposed intersection to meet all of the report’s recommendations. He did express concern, however, with the recommendation to remove all trees within 14 feet from the edge of pavement. Mr. Otstot asked if the applicants could meet all the recommendations from the Reveer Group report. Mr. Woody and Mr. Pantlik both responded in the affirmative. Mr. Pantlik also introduced Jordan Phillips, one of the principals in Atlantic Partners.

Chairman Driscoll then called on consultant Bob George of G. Robert George and Associates. The town contracted with Mr. George to perform an independent review of the project’s stormwater plans.

Mr. George began his presentation by complimenting the quality and reputation of the engineer, Thomas and Hutton. He stated that his comments were based on his review of the preliminary drawings, and he recommended a detailed review of the final stormwater designs
be conducted once completed. Mr. George stated that the existing lagoon at Freshfields has more than enough capacity to serve the site, but added that the capacity of the culverts will need to be evaluated. He stated that he has been working with the town to get outfall permits for Seabrook Island Road and added that working with OCRM is a nightmare; however, the town has received a permit for three additional tide gates, which should help flooding problems in this area. Mr. George concluded that he had no major concerns regarding the storm drainage plans, but again recommended town approval of the final plans.

Chairman Driscoll asked if this project would impact the town’s ongoing drainage improvements on Seabrook Island Road. Mr. George responded that it would not. Chairman Driscoll thanked Mr. George for his comments.

Chairman Driscoll then called on Jim Bannwart, Chairman of the Seabrook Island Utility Commission. Chairman Driscoll noted that the Utility Commission was obligated to provide utility service to the property due to a legacy agreement between Heater of Seabrook (the previous owner of the utility system) and the property owner.

Chairman Driscoll asked Mr. Bannwart if the Utility Commission had the capacity to serve the project. Mr. Bannwart responded that the town’s sewer plant is rated for up to 1.1 million gallons per day and is currently operating at approximately 500,000 gallons per day. Because of this pre-existing commitment, the Commission has anticipated future service at this property as part of their overall planning process. Mr. Bannwart added that the Commission’s staff was currently reviewing the plans, but the daily impact of the facility was projected to be around 37,000 gallons per day. Mr. Pantlik clarified that the property would receive sewer service from the town; however, water service would be provided by the St. John’s Water Company.

Chairman Driscoll then called on consultant Paul Ford, a civil engineer with the Reveer Group. The town contracted with the Reveer Group to perform an independent review of the project’s traffic impact analysis and intersection design plans.

Mr. Ford provided an overview of the Reveer Group’s findings and recommendations, which were outlined in a report provided to members of the Planning Commission and the applicant in advance of the meeting. He stated that he would focus on three main items: the location and geometry of the proposed intersection; the impact to the existing tree canopy; and the need for an intersection to serve this property.

Mr. Ford stated that the design was reviewed based on the SCDOT ARMS Manual. The review identified a few inconsistencies with SCDOT specifications, including the need for turn lane extensions, taper adjustments, and modifications to turning radii to accommodate trucks and emergency vehicles. He also touched on the town’s access management regulations, which requires intersections to be spaced at least one half-mile apart, where feasible. He stated that if this intersection is approved, the next one down the road will be more difficult to justify.
Regarding the oak trees, Mr. Ford stated that he would probably not require all trees within 14 feet of the right-of-way to be removed; however, as an engineer, he had an obligation to disclose this conflict with the ARMS manual.

Chairman Driscoll asked if the preservation of sight lines was his primary concern. Mr. Ford responded in the affirmative and added that when trees are closer to the edge of pavement, they become more of a liability. Chairman Driscoll asked if they could be simply limbed up? Mr. Ford responded that this was a possibility, but they appeared to be pretty well maintained.

Noting that the applicant has already agreed to most of the Reveer Group’s most significant recommendations, Chairman Driscoll then asked if there were any suggestions to which the applicant had not already agreed. Mr. Ford responded that the project itself isn’t a real traffic generator, and that the project will only add a couple seconds to travel times on adjacent roads. He stated that the key question was whether this access point was a want or a need. He said that this question was not really evaluated in the TIA. He asked why an additional access point would be needed for a project with such a minimal traffic impact.

Chairman Driscoll asked if someone from the applicant could address this question. Mr. Richard Ackerman of Big Rock Partners LLC, the developer of the project, stated that the second access would serve several purposes, including: emergency access, better circulation, improved convenience, and creating a presence for the project on Seabrook Island Road which would aid in marketing and sales.

Chairman Driscoll asked whether a senior facility could operate without two access points. Mr. Ackerman noted that the square footage of this facility would be larger than the existing shopping center. He added that two access points were necessary to serve three populations (independent living, assisted living and memory care) with three separate entrances.

Chairman Driscoll asked how many entrances there were at the Bishop Gadsden facility on James Island. It was determined that there were two access points from Camp Road. Mr. Ackerman stated that he couldn’t imagine the Fire Department would want only a single access point.

Ms. Patterson asked if fire trucks were able to navigate through Freshfields. Mr. Ackerman responded that Freshfields would not have been built if fire trucks could not access the property. He added, however, that the demographics of a shopping center were different than a senior center, where emergency services would be dealing with different types of people, including seniors, alzheimer’s patients, etc.

Ms. Patterson asked if the facility would have a sprinkler system. Mr. Ackerman responded that it would. It would also be constructed of concrete and steel, and would feature an enhanced alarm system.

Ms. Patterson asked if residents would be permitted to have personal aides. Mr. Ackerman responded that they could. Ms. Patterson noted that this may increase the traffic impact.
Mr. Billian asked how many entrances there would be to the underground parking. Mr. Ackerman stated that residents would go in one end and out the other. He added that the developer elected to hide the parking areas under the building, which was a design feature that came at great expense. Mr. Billian also asked if there would be valet parking. Mr. Ackerman responded in the affirmative, but not for handicapped parking.

Mr. Otstot asked what kind of signage would be used for the property. Mr. Ackerman said the signage plan had not been finalized, but would meet all zoning and PUD requirements under the Town of Kiawah Island.

Ms. Patterson if the applicants were proposing to restrict access to and through the property. Mr. Ackerman responded that they were not planning to restrict access and added that a gate would defeat the purpose of having a turn lane.

Town Administrator Cronin noted that the TIA did not include any assumptions for Seabrook Island residents utilizing the new access as a short cut into Freshfields. He asked Mr. Ford whether he felt additional cut through traffic would adversely impact the operation of a new intersection. Mr. Ford responded that he didn’t think it would create any noticeable impact. He also added that the existing traffic circle operates pretty well, and that using this intersection as a cut through probably wouldn’t save much time.

Mr. Billian asked about future development plans in Kiawah Island. Mr. Permar responded that there were approximately 200-300 vacant lots remaining in Kiawah, inclusive of the Timbers project. He also noted the rebirth of the West Beach Village Inn project as a future traffic generator. He stated that he didn’t anticipate any other major projects starting in the next few years, including on the Haulover Creek (Goodwin) property, as Kiawah needs land to handle parking needs for upcoming PGA Championship events.

There being no further questions, Chairman Driscoll asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak.

Resident Janet Pasquale provided comments. Ms. Pasquale asked when the traffic study was completed. Chairman Driscoll responded that the TIA was conducted on the day after Memorial Day. Ms. Pasquale asked how many vehicles could be in the stacking lane at any given time. Mr. Woody responded that the stacking lane would be 150 feet, so depending on the length of vehicles, it would likely handle 6-8 vehicles at a time. Lastly, she asked if the Town of Kiawah Island or the developer would contribute to the maintenance of Seabrook Island Road. Chairman Driscoll said he couldn’t answer that question, and deferred to the applicant. Mr. Permar responded that neither Seabrook Island nor Kiawah Island collect a property tax. Therefore, Seabrook Island residents would not be expected to be taxed any higher to maintain the road. Ms. Patterson asked who would maintain the striping. Mr. Pantlik responded that as a Seabrook Island road, it was assumed that the town would maintain it.
There being no further comments, Chairman Driscoll requested a motion to table consideration of this request until a future date has been identified to meet as a group for further discussion.

Mr. Otstot made a motion to table the request. Ms. Patterson seconded the motion. The motion to table was approved by a vote of 5-0.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION / DISCUSSION

1. **Upcoming Meeting Dates**: Chairman Driscoll stated that the next meeting of the Planning Commission would take place on September 12th, rather than the regular meeting date of September 5th. This was the first date that all five members, as well as the Town Administrator, would be able to meet.

There being no further business, Mr. Billian made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Leary seconded the motion. The vote in favor of the motion was 5-0, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:27 pm.

Minutes Approved: Joseph M. Cronin
Town Administrator
TO: Town of Seabrook Island Planning Commission Members
FROM: Joseph M. Cronin, Town Administrator
SUBJECT: Architectural Review: Equestrian Center Modifications and Expansion (Amended)
MEETING DATE: September 26, 2018

The Planning Commission is asked to review and approve an updated request from the Seabrook Island Club for proposed modifications to the existing barn at the Seabrook Island Club Equestrian Center, located at 3122 Seabrook Island Road. The property is zoned PDD-Parks & Recreation (APR) Subdistrict.

The Planning Commission reviewed and approved an earlier rendering during its May 2018 meeting. At that time, the proposed modifications included the following:

- Construction of a 359 square foot addition to the existing first floor (front)
- Construction of a 840 square foot addition to the second floor (front)
- Addition of a 130 square foot covered porch to the second floor (front)
- Addition and reconfiguration of administrative space
- Renovation of existing tack room
- Creation of new feed storage space
- Construction of a new handicapped accessible lavatory
- Repair, as required, of existing siding and trim
- Replace all interior and exterior horse stall doors
- Replace all interior light fixtures and fans
- Construction of 3’ concrete sidewalk
- Maintenance items, as shown in the attached scope of work
- No increase in the number of existing horse stalls
- Removal of one existing crepe myrtle at the front entry

The project has since been revised due to cost and the Club is now requesting approval of a modified plan. The most significant changes include the removal of the second floor covered porch, as well as a portion of the first floor addition, both of which were proposed to be located at the front of the building.

Similar to the original request, the proposed colors and materials will match those of the existing structure. Plans illustrating the proposed modifications, as well as photos of the existing building, are attached for review.
Section 11-20 of the town’s Development Standards Ordinance (DSO) contains the following parking requirement for Equestrian Centers: “One (1) space for each two (2) horses boarded or boarding space available to rent.” Because the proposed modifications will not result in any increase to the number of boarding spaces available to rent, no additional parking spaces will be required.

A set of the revised building plans are included for review.

**Staff Recommendation**

In our opinion, the proposed modifications are consistent with the requirements of the town’s DSO. Therefore, staff recommends in favor of **APPROVAL**.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph M. Cronin  
Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator
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GENERAL NOTES:

1. FOUNDATION AND STRUCTURAL MEMBERS SHALL BE DESIGNED TO RESIST ALL ACTIONS INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO WIND, SEISMIC, AND FIRE. FOR MORE INFORMATION SEE THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE, AS APPLICABLE, OR THE NC SBCC. AS A MINIMUM, SEE THE DRAWINGS FOR ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE CODES.

2. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE FOUNDATION AND STRUCTURAL FRAMEWORK AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PREPARATION OF SHOP DRAWINGS TO REFLECT ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS.

3. THE CONTRACTOR IS TO PREPARE SHOP DRAWINGS FOR ALL CONSTRUCTION SHOWN. THE contractor SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS FOR ALL CONSTRUCTION SHOWN AS REQUIRED BY THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS.

4. IN CASE OF CONFLICT BETWEEN DRAWINGS AND OR SPECIFICATIONS, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION SHOWN ON THE PRINTS. ALL WORK SHOWN ON THE BLUEPRINTS AND/OR THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONSIDER ALL OF THE CODES, REGULATIONS, AND CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH WORK SHOWN ON THE PRINTS.

5. IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS TO THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER FOR ALL STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS THAT ARE NOT SHOWN ON THE PRINTS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS TO THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER FOR ALL STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS THAT ARE NOT SHOWN ON THE PRINTS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS TO THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER FOR ALL STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS THAT ARE NOT SHOWN ON THE PRINTS.

6. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BUILD THE PROJECT IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO ENSURE THE PROTECTION OF ALL APPLICABLE CODES AND STANDARDS THAT GOVERN THE WORK.

7. CONTRACTOR TO NOTIFY ALL CONSTRUCTION COMPANIES AND CONTRACTORS THAT THE FOUNDATIONS AND THE STRUCTURAL FRAMEWORKS ARE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PREPARATION OF SHOP DRAWINGS TO REFLECT ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE CODES.

8. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL RESERVE THE RIGHT TO MAKE ANY REVISIONS TO ANY DRAWINGS THAT RELATE TO OTHER TRADES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH THE STANDARDS SET FORTH IN THE DOCUMENTATION OF THE CONTRACTOR. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT AND CONTRACTOR OF ANY REVISIONS.

9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT AND CONTRACTOR OF ANY REVISIONS.

GEOTECHNICAL:

1. THE CONTRACTOR IS REQUIRED TO SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS TO THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER FOR ALL STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS THAT ARE NOT SHOWN ON THE PRINTS.

2. IF THE FOUNDATION DESIGNS HAVE BEEN CHANGED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT AND CONTRACTOR OF ANY REVISIONS.

3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE SHOP DRAWINGS TO THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER FOR ALL STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS THAT ARE NOT SHOWN ON THE PRINTS.

4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL RESERVE THE RIGHT TO MAKE ANY REVISIONS TO ANY DRAWINGS THAT RELATE TO OTHER TRADES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH THE STANDARDS SET FORTH IN THE DOCUMENTATION OF THE CONTRACTOR. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT AND CONTRACTOR OF ANY REVISIONS.

5. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL RESERVE THE RIGHT TO MAKE ANY REVISIONS TO ANY DRAWINGS THAT RELATE TO OTHER TRADES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH THE STANDARDS SET FORTH IN THE DOCUMENTATION OF THE CONTRACTOR. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT AND CONTRACTOR OF ANY REVISIONS.

CONCRETE:

1. ALL CONCRETE AND REINFORCEMENT MUST BE INSTALLATION TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL APPROPRIATE CODES AND STANDARDS.
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CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY EXISTING FOUNDATION IN THIS LOCATION FOR ADEQUATE BEARING FOR PROPOSED NEW CONSTRUCTION. PROVIDE (3) #5 DOWELS INTO EXISTING FOOTING. DRILL AND EPOXY W/ MIN 9" EMBEDMENT (TYP @ ALL NEW/OLD INTERSECTION)

4" CONCRETE SLAB W/ 6 x 6 W1.4 W.W.M OVER 6 MIL POLY VINYL & STRUCTURAL COMPACTED FILL

TURN DOWN SLAB EDGE DETAIL - SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS FOR DETAILS

PROVIDE #5 DOWELS INTO EXISTING SLAB. DRILL AND EPOXY W/ MIN 9" EMBEDMENT (TYP @ ALL NEW/OLD INTERSECTION)

NOTE:
1. CONTRACTOR SHALL USE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS FOR ALL DIMENSIONS & BUILDING LAYOUT.

S1.1
FOUNDATION PLAN

102'-0" +/- EXISTING
72'-4" +/- EXISTING
17'-4"
24'-0" +/- EXISTING
24'-4" +/- EXISTING
72'-4"
UPPER FLOOR FRAMING PLAN

NOTE:
1. ALL EXTERIOR WALL HEADERS SHALL BE 3-2 x 10 W/ 2-1/2" SPACER U.N.O.
2. PROVIDE 1 3/4" x 18" LVL RIMBOARD AROUND ENTIRE TRUSS PERIMETER
3. ALL COLUMNS TO BE STRUCTURAL

18" OPEN WEB TRUSS
FLOOR JOISTS 16" o/c

DOUBLE TRUSS
OPEN
DOUBLE TRUSS
ROOF RAFTERS TO PROVIDE CEILING IN THIS AREA

2-1 3/4" x 18" LVL GIRDER
5 1/2" x 5 1/2" PSL COLUMN
ROOF RAFTERS TO PROVIDE CEILING IN THIS AREA

2-1 3/4" x 18" LVL GIRDER
2 x 10 WD CEIL'G JOISTS @ 16" o/c

2-1 3/4" x 18" LVL GIRDER
4 x 10 WD GIRDER - SEE BRACKET DETAIL

3-1 3/4" x 18" LVL GIRDER
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Addition & Alteration to Exist Barn

Ceiling Framing Plan

NOTE:
1. All exterior wall headers shall be 2-2 x 8 w/ 1/2" spacer
2. See building sections for location of 2 x 6 WD collar ties @ 32" o/c
3. All columns to be structural.

2 x 10 WD ceiling joists @ 16" o/c
3-2 x 12 WD header
Addition & Alteration to Exist Barn
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MECHANICAL GENERAL NOTES:

1. MECHANICAL DRAWINGS ARE DIAGRAMMATIC. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REFER TO ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS FOR LAYOUT AND LOCATION OF MOUNTING BAY, SUPPORTS, ETC. TRADE SPECIFICATIONS AND CONTRACT DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY THE CONTRACTOR ARE TO BE REFERRED TO FOR MORE COMPLETE INFORMATION.

2. DUCT SIZES INDICATED ARE INSIDE CLEAR DIMENSIONS. PROVIDE DUCTWORK IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF SMACNA'S "LOW PRESSURE DUCT CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS" AND OTHER ENGINEERING DRAWINGS AND COORDINATE EXACT LOCATIONS OF EQUIPMENT, DUCTS, PIPING, ETC. WITH THE WORK OF OTHER TRADES. FIELD MEASURE STRUCTURAL OPENINGS AND PASSAGES PRIOR TO PURCHASING DUCTWORK.

3. PROVIDE MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDED CLEARANCES FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT. PROVIDE ACCESS FOR CHANGING FILTERS AND REMOVING FANS AND DRIVES IN THE INDOOR SECTIONS OF ALL AHU'S.

4. PROVIDE TRAPPED CONDENSATE DRAIN PIPING FROM ALL UNITS. CONDENSATE PIPING SHALL BE 2" W.G. OR LESS. DRAIN PANS ON ALL UNITS WITH A FLOAT SWITCH TO SHUT DOWN UNIT UPON SENSING CONDENSATE FULL SIZE OF CONNECTION ON UNIT OR 3/4", WHICHEVER IS LARGER. PROVIDE AUXILIARY CONDENSATE DRAIN PANS ON ALL UNITS WITH A FLOAT SWITCH TO SHUT DOWN UNIT UPON SENSING CONDENSATE IN THE AUXILIARY PAN. ALSO, PROVIDE DRAIN PIPE FROM AUXILIARY PAN.

5. PROVIDE MANUAL VOLUME DAMPERS IN THE MAIN RA AND OA DUCTS FOR ALL HEAT PUMPS. MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDED CLEARANCES FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ALL CURVED DUCT ELBOWS WITH RADIUS RATIOS OF NOT LESS THAN 1.5.

6. INSTALL DUCTWORK IN ACCORDANCE WITH SMACNA. PROVIDE 2" THICK FIBERGLASS DUCT INSULATION WITH INTEGRAL VAPOR BARRIER. FLEXIBLE DUCT MAY BE USED IN CONCEALED LOCATIONS FOR FINAL CONNECTION TO CEILING-MOUNTED DIFFUSERS AND CABINET FANS. LIMIT FLEXIBLE DUCT LENGTHS TO A TOTAL OF 6 FEET.

7. DUCT SIZES AND INSULATION THICKNESS SHOULD BE IN Accordance WITH THE CONTRACTOR'S VENDOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS. DUCT INSULATION SHALL INCLUDE REINFORCED FIRE-RETARDANT JACKET ON EXTERIOR OF ALL DUCTS. DUCT INSULATION SHALL INCLUDE REINFORCED FIRE-RETARDANT JACKET.

8. REFRIGERANT PIPING SHALL BE SIZED BY HEAT PUMP MANUFACTURER.

9. PROVIDE PROGRAMABLE THERMOSTATS.

10. PROVIDE FOR FRESH / MAKEUP AIR INTAKE FOR SYSTEM TO MAINTAIN A POSITIVE PRESSURE INSIDE BUILDING.

11. MECHANICAL DRAWINGS ARE DIAGRAMMATIC. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REFER TO ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS FOR LAYOUT AND LOCATION OF MOUNTING BAY, SUPPORTS, ETC. TRADE SPECIFICATIONS AND CONTRACT DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY THE CONTRACTOR ARE TO BE REFERRED TO FOR MORE COMPLETE INFORMATION.

The Club @ Seabrook Equestrian Center
2313 Seabrook Island Rd
Seabrook Island, SC
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MECHANICAL GENERAL NOTES:

1. MECHANICAL DRAWINGS ARE DIAGRAMMATIC. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REFER TO ARCHITECTURAL, STRUCTURAL, ELECTRICAL, AND OTHER ENGINEERING DRAWINGS AND COORDINATE EXACT LOCATIONS OF EQUIPMENT, DUCTS, PIPING, ETC. WITH THE WORK OF OTHER TRADES. FIELD MEASURE STRUCTURAL OPENINGS AND PASSAGES PRIOR TO PURCHASING DUCTWORK.

2. DUCT SIZES INDICATED ARE INSIDE CLEAR DIMENSIONS. PROVIDE DUCTWORK IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF SMACNA'S "LOW PRESSURE DUCT CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS". FLEXIBLE DUCT MAY BE USED IN CONCEALED LOCATIONS FOR FINAL CONNECTION TO CEILING-MOUNTED DIFFUSERS AND CABINET FANS. LIMIT FLEXIBLE DUCT LENGTHS TO A TOTAL OF 6 FEET. PROVIDE AUXILIARY CONDENSATE DRAIN PIPING FROM ALL UNITS. CONDENSATE PIPING SHALL BE IN THE AUXILIARY PAN. ALSO, PROVIDE DRAIN PIPE FROM AUXILIARY PAN.

3. PROVIDE MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDED CLEARANCES FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ALL CURVED DUCT ELBOWS WITH RADIUS RATIOS OF NOT LESS THAN 1.5.

4. PROVIDE TRAPPED CONDENSATE DRAIN PIPING FROM ALL UNITS. CONDENSATE PIPING SHALL BE IN THE AUXILIARY PAN. ALSO, PROVIDE DRAIN PIPE FROM AUXILIARY PAN. IN THE AUXILIARY PAN, ALSO, PROVIDE DRAIN PIPE FROM AUXILIARY PAN.

5. PROVIDE MANUAL VOLUME DAMPERS IN THE MAIN RA AND OA DUCTS FOR ALL HEAT PUMPS.

6. INSTALL DUCTWORK IN ACCORDANCE WITH SMACNA. PROVIDE 2" THICK FIBERGLASS DUCT INSULATION WITH INTEGRAL VAPOR BARRIER.

7. PROVIDE MANUAL VOLUME DAMPERS IN THE MAIN RA AND OA DUCTS FOR ALL HEAT PUMPS.

8. REFRIGERANT PIPING SHALL BE SIZED BY HEAT PUMP MANUFACTURER.

9. SEAL CLASS C IS REQUIRED FOR ALL JOINTS WITH DUCT STATIC PRESSURE CLASS RATING OF 2" W.G. OR LESS.

10. PROVIDE FOR FRESH / MAKEUP AIR INTAKE FOR SYSTEM TO MAINTAIN A POSITIVE PRESSURE INSIDE BUILDING.
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E1.1
MAIN FLOOR ELECTRICAL PLAN

ELECTRICAL GENERAL NOTES:
1. All work to be done in accordance with national, state and local codes.
2. All fixtures to be approved by owner prior to being installed.
3. Electrical contractor shall be responsible to all equipment shown on the drawings including, but not limited to, the mechanical equipment, telephone lines, fans, pumps, motors, etc. The final placement of all outlets, lights, and switches to be field verified with the owner prior to work being completed.
4. Provide spare circuits as required to accommodate landscape lighting.
5. Contractor to provide all materials, labor, transportation, and equipment as requested in contract.
6. Smoke detectors to be installed and located per codes.
7. Exit detectors to be installed and located per codes.
8. All electrical fixtures and equipment shall be installed in the locations shown on the drawings. Electrical panelboards shall be clearly marked using typed identification labels on each circuit.
9. All switches, receptacles & junction boxes to be flush mounted.
10. All work to be in accordance with the 2012 electrical and energy codes. Where specified, use a panel of 10% temper efficient fixtures.
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8. All electrical fixtures and equipment shall be installed in the locations shown on the drawings. Electrical panelboards shall be clearly marked using typed identification labels on each circuit.
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Addition & Alteration to Exisit Barn

P. O. Box 22026
Charleston, SC 29413

MICHAEL E. KARAMUS
ARCHITECT, L.L.C.

THESE DRAWINGS & SPECIFICATIONS ARE THE INSTRUMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
PROVIDED BY
MICHAEL E. KARAMUS ARCHITECT, L.L.C.
AS SUCH, THESE DRAWINGS
ARE NOT TO BE USED OR REPRODUCED, EITHER IN PART OR WHOLLY BY ANY PARTIES FOR ANY USE OTHER THAN THE PROJECT DESCRIBED HEREIN. ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THESE DOCUMENTS, BOTH WRITTEN AND VISUAL, IS AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF
MICHAEL E. KARAMUS ARCHITECT, L.L.C.

The Club @ Seabrook
Equestrian Center
2313 Seabrook Island Rd
Seabrook Island, SC

E1.1
MAIN FLOOR ELECTRICAL PLAN

ELECTRICAL GENERAL NOTES:
1. All work to be done in accordance with national, state and local codes.
2. All fixtures to be approved by owner prior to being installed.
3. Electrical contractor shall be responsible to all equipment shown on the drawings including, but not limited to, the mechanical equipment, telephone lines, fans, pumps, motors, etc. The final placement of all outlets, lights, and switches to be field verified with the owner prior to work being completed.
4. Provide spare circuits as required to accommodate landscape lighting.
5. Contractor to provide all materials, labor, transportation, and equipment as requested in contract.
6. Smoke detectors to be installed and located per codes.
7. Exit detectors to be installed and located per codes.
8. All electrical fixtures and equipment shall be installed in the locations shown on the drawings. Electrical panelboards shall be clearly marked using typed identification labels on each circuit.
9. All switches, receptacles & junction boxes to be flush mounted.
10. All work to be in accordance with the 2012 electrical and energy codes. Where specified, use a panel of 10% temper efficient fixtures.
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PERMIT SET

ELECTRICAL LEGEND

1. All work to be done in accordance with national, state and local codes.
2. All fixtures to be approved by owner prior to being installed.
3. Electrical contractor shall provide service to all equipment shown on the drawings including, but not limited to, the mechanical equipment, telephone lines, fans, pumps, motors, etc.
4. The final placement of all outlets, lights, and switches to be field verified with the owner prior to work being completed.
5. Provide spare circuits as required to accommodate landscape lighting.
6. Contractor to provide all materials, labor, transportation, and equipment as required for a complete job.
7. All switches, receptacles & junction boxes to be flush mounted.
8. All receptacles to be mounted @ 18" A.F.F. U.N.O.
9. All switches to be mounted @ 48" A.F.F. U.N.O.
10. All switches and receptacles in storage shall be GFI @ 42" A.F.F. U.N.O.
11. All switches and outlets in storage shall be GFI @ 42" A.F.F. U.N.O.
12. All work to be in accordance with the 2012 Electrical and Energy Codes, unless otherwise noted in a specific location or project.

ELECTRICAL GENERAL NOTES:

1. All work to be done in accordance with national, state and local codes.
2. All fixtures to be approved by owner prior to being installed.
3. Electrical contractor shall provide service to all equipment shown on the drawings including, but not limited to, the mechanical equipment, telephone lines, fans, pumps, motors, etc.
4. Final placement of all outlets, lights, and switches to be field verified with the owner prior to work being completed.
5. Provide spare circuits as required to accommodate landscape lighting.
6. Contractor to provide all materials, labor, transportation, and equipment as required for a complete job.
7. All switches, receptacles & junction boxes to be flush mounted.
8. All receptacles to be mounted @ 18" A.F.F. U.N.O.
9. All switches to be mounted @ 48" A.F.F. U.N.O.
10. All switches and receptacles in storage shall be GFI @ 42" A.F.F. U.N.O.
11. All work to be in accordance with the 2012 Electrical and Energy Codes, unless otherwise noted in a specific location or project.
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Town of Seabrook Island Planning Commission Members
FROM: Joseph M. Cronin, Town Administrator
SUBJECT: Architectural Review: SIPOA Storage Shed
MEETING DATE: September 26, 2018

The Planning Commission is asked to review and approve a request from the Seabrook Island Property Owners Association for construction of a proposed storage shed at the SIPOA Maintenance Facility, located at 2832 Seabrook Island Road.

The property is zoned Commercial-Retail/Office (CRO). While a storage shed or maintenance facility is not expressly listed as a permitted use within the CRO district, § 5.50.20 of the DSO states:

“Any proposed commercial/retail office use not specifically allowed under the permitted uses set forth above may be allowed by the Planning Commission if it finds the proposed use satisfies the following criteria:

(a) The proposed use complies with all applicable federal, state and local laws and ordinances.
(b) Development plans for the proposed use minimizes potentially detrimental impacts to the site and surrounding areas and meet all buffer requirements.
(c) The proposed use assumes safe and convenient ingress and egress from the property and internal circulation, including access of service and emergency vehicles and design of off-street parking and loading areas.
(d) The proposed use provides safe location and orderly arrangement in the placement of all buildings and structures.
(e) The proposed use minimizes environmental damage caused by the destruction of natural vegetation.
(f) The proposed use takes all reasonable means of minimizing intrusions of noise, light, odor, dust and other similar noises into surrounding areas.
(g) Lighting fixtures and sign placement shall not constitute a hazard to traffic.
(h) The proposed size, scope and scale of the use requested shall be appropriate for the property upon which it is to be located and may not be inconsistent with the size, scope and scale of other adjoining areas and developments.”

The minimum setbacks within the CRO districts are as follows:

- Abutting streets or roads: 50 feet, except when any lot fronts on a regime-owned private drive or road, in which case such the lot shall have a front setback of thirty (30) feet from the front property line. (§ 5.50.40.10.)
- **Side: 50 feet**, except on interior lots of a common regime where the adjoining uses are similar in which case the side setback shall be 20 feet from the property line dividing adjoining lots, to be buffered and landscaped. (§ 5.50.40.20.)
- **Rear: 35 feet** rear, to be buffered and landscaped. (§ 5.50.40.30.)

In addition, all development within the CRO must meet the parking, signage, fencing, buffering and landscaping requirements of Articles (8) through (12) of the DSO.

The proposed structure will be 30’ x 40’, with a total area of 1,200 square feet. The proposed colors (Lightstone) and materials (galvanized metal with silicone polyester coating) are consistent with those of the adjacent SIPOA maintenance building and club laundry facility. Plans illustrating the proposed structure, as well as photos of adjacent buildings, are attached for review.

**Staff Recommendation**

In our opinion, the proposed structure is consistent with the requirements of the town’s DSO, and is harmonious with the colors and materials used on surrounding structures. The building will meet all setback requirements and will be sufficiently screened from neighboring uses by existing vegetation. Therefore, staff recommends in favor of APPROVAL.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph M. Cronin
Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator
TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND
2001 Seabrook Island Road
Seabrook Island, SC 29455
843-768-9121 (phone)
843-768-9830 (fax)

ZONING PERMIT APPLICATION

Fee Schedule
Permit for New Construction, Single Family $100
Permit Extension $100
Permit for Remodeling, Addition, etc. 100
Building, HVAC, Roofing, Plumbing, etc. 25
Permit for New Construction, Multi-Family 250 + $5 per unit
Multiple Bldg Permit, Comm./Multi Family 100

Date: 9-7-18 TMS #: 149 06 00072

Applicant's Name: SIPOA

Name of Business Contact: Steve Hirsch

Address: 1202 Landfall Way Phone: 843-768-0061
City: Johns Is State: SC Zip: 29455

Property Owner's Name: Same

Address: __________________________ Phone: ______________
City: __________________________ State: ______________ Zip: ______________

Property Location Address: Maintenance Shop 0 2832 Seabrook Is. Rd
Lot: ______ Block: ______ Base Flood Elev. 12 Zone: AE

Purpose of Permit: construct a storage shed
adjacent to maintenance building

Value of Construction: $30,000 POA Approval: already approved
Applicant's Signature: __________________________

**This is an application only. The permit will be issued upon approval by the Town of Seabrook Island.**
Johns Island, SC 29455

Shed Location

Imagery ©2018 Google, Map data ©2018 Google

50 ft

Johns Island, SC 29455

 Mostly Cloudy · 80°F

3:11 PM

Postal Code

https://www.google.com/maps/place/Johns+Island,+SC+29455/@32.5897686,-80.1559143,137m/data=!3m1!1e3!4m5!3m4!1s0x88fc2b6a593ed8bb:0x...
STANDARD PANEL PAINT SYSTEMS

Exterior painted roof and wall panels are precision roll formed from pre-painted galvanized or Galvalume® coils. The metal is first subjected to a strenuous cleaning process followed by the application of an oven-cured primer. Next the finish coat is applied under constant monitoring for proper cure temperature and color uniformity. Before panels are formed, the finished coil is subjected to stringent quality control tests including: physical bend resistance, impact resistance; and film thickness, hardness, gloss, and color. The standard paint system is an industry proven Silicone-Polyester coating. Silicone-Polyester is a recognized standard of product quality for exterior building systems. Printed colors are matched as closely as possible. Exact color match should be made from metal chip samples.

*Liner panels for wall and roof are normally provided in a 28 gage panel coated with a highly serviceable interior grade white polyester coating. Liner panels are for inside use and are not intended to be exposed to the effects of weather or sunlight. All painted wall and trim products are painted with the same high quality paint system described here. Galvalume® Trim may be available at a slight increase in price.

*Backer side primer colors may vary.

SILICONIZED POLYESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burnished Slate (BS)</th>
<th>Evergreen (EG)</th>
<th>Aztec Blue (AB)</th>
<th>Brick Red (BR)</th>
<th>Sagebrush Tan (SB)</th>
<th>Fox Gray (FG)</th>
<th>Lightstone (LS)</th>
<th>Polar White (PW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Color - For Illustration Purposes Only
(Not Actual Building)
### PACKING LIST EXAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12345</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BILL OF LADING EXAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Qty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUNDLE LABEL EXAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12345</td>
<td>ABC CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DRAWING NUMBER EXAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12345</td>
<td>C126431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12345</td>
<td>C126431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUILDING CODES

- **International Building Code (IBC)**
- **Unified Building Code (UBC)**
- **National Electrical Code (NEC)**
- **American Institute of Steel Construction (AISC)**

### BUILDING LABELS

- **Frame Label**: 12345
- **Truss Label**: C126431
- **Panel Label**: ABC CONSTRUCTION
ANCHOR ROD PLAN

NOTE: All Base Plates ± 100'-0" (Finish Floor) (UNLESS NOTED)
PORTAL FRAME BETWEEN LINES 1 & 3 @ ELEV. "A"

GENERAL NOTES:

SEE ROOF FRAMING PLAN AND SIDEWALL ELEVATIONS FOR MAIN FRAME PIECE MARKS.
SIDEWALL FRAMING: FRAME LINE C

SIDEWALL SHEETING & TRIM: FRAME LINE C

GENERAL NOTES:
TRIM IS FIGURED WITH 3" TRIM GAP UNLESS NOTED ON A DETAIL.
FIELD CUT PANELS AT FRAMES OPENING, WALKWAYS, AND WINDOWS.
SEABROOK ISLAND PROPERTY
1202 LANDFALL WAY
JOHNS ISLAND, SC 29455

JOB NUMBER: 141835
BUILDING SIZE: 30.00' x 40.00' x 10.00' x 12.50' (1.0:12)

JOBSITE: 2902 SEABROOK ISLAND RD.
JOHNS ISLAND, SC 29455

Gentleman:
This is to certify that the above referenced project, along with its component parts, has been designed and fabricated by SCHULTE BUILDING SYSTEMS

In addition to all applicable order documents, this structure has been designed in accordance with the appropriate edition of the AISC "Manual of Steel Construction" and with good engineering practice for the following loads. All welding has been completed per the appropriate American Welding Society (AWS) code.

Governing Code for application of design loads: IBC 15

IMPORTANCE FACTORS: WIND: N/A SNOW: 1.000 SEISMIC: 1.000
DEAD LOAD Weight of metal building structure only as supplied by SCHULTE BUILDING SYSTEMS
COLLATERAL LOAD 3 PSF
LIVE LOAD 20.00 PSF - Tributary area reduction allowed? Yes
WIND LOAD (V 35) N/A
WIND LOAD (Vult & Vasc) 150 MPH, 116 MPH
OCCUPANCY / RISK CATEGORY II - Normal
WIND EXPOSURE C
INTERNAL PRESSURE COEFFICIENT +/- 0.55
SITE CLASS D
SEISMIC DESIGN CATEGORY D
SPECTRAL RESPONSE ACCELERATIONS Ss = 1.0690 S1 = 0.3400
GROUND SNOW LOAD (Pg) 5 PSF
ROOF SNOW LOADS, FLAT (Pf), SLOPED (Ps) 4.20 PSF, 4.20 PSF
ADDITIONAL LOADS N/A

This Letter of Certification applies solely to the metal building and its component parts as furnished by SCHULTE BUILDING SYSTEMS and specifically excludes any foundation, masonry, or general contract work.

Sincerely

Design Engineer

August 21, 2018
The Planning Commission is asked to review and provide a recommendation on a proposed amendment to the Development Standards Ordinance (DSO) for the purpose of amending the requirements for walls and fences.

Currently, the town’s DSO requires walls and fences to be constructed with the following materials: “stucco, cypress, pressure-treated wood, or similar materials.” Despite these restrictions, staff has identified several walls and fences that were permitted using other materials, such as architectural concrete masonry unit (CMU) retaining walls, and powder coated aluminum fences. Upon consulting with a representative from the SIPOA Architectural Review Committee (ARC), it was determined that the ARC allows materials which are not permitted under the town’s DSO. It is our recommendation that the DSO be amended to eliminate this conflict.

If approved, the proposed text amendment would allow the following types of materials:

- **Walls:** Stucco, cypress, pressure-treated wood, wood composite, brick, stone, architectural concrete masonry units (CMU), or similar materials.

- **Fences:** Stucco, cypress, pressure-treated wood, wood composite, iron, powder coated aluminum, or similar materials. The draft ordinance also recommends prohibition of the following materials: barbed wire, concertina wire, razor wire, chain link, poultry wire and vinyl.

The current ordinance does not specify any additional requirements regarding height, location, or drainage impacts of walls and fences. In addition to amending the permitted materials, the proposed text amendment also includes the following recommendations:

- Defining the setback requirements for walls and fences as 50% of the required side or rear setback for principal structures;

- Prohibiting walls and fences within a required marsh or beachfront setback;

- Requiring that walls and fences be maintained in good repair;
• A 6’ maximum height for walls and fences (the planning commission may approve taller walls and fences when used to screen a public building or storage yard, utility structures or equipment, or an approved outdoor storage area in a commercial or industrial district)

• A 3’ maximum height for walls and fences in sight easements and clear sight triangles;

• Requiring a finished side (if any) to face outward from the property;

• Requiring plant materials to be installed on the exterior side of a wall or fence; and

• Requiring that walls and fences not negatively impact drainage on the site or on adjacent properties.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends in favor of APPROVAL of the proposed text amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph M. Cronin
Town Administrator
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA; ARTICLE 10, BUFFERS, LANDSCAPING AND TREE PROTECTION; SECTION 10.60, SPECIFICATIONS FOR WALLS, FENCES AND HEDGES; SO AS TO AMEND THE GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR WALLS AND FENCES

WHEREAS, Section 10.60 of the Development Standards Ordinance outlines the general requirements for walls and fences; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council for the Town of Seabrook Island desire to amend the Development Standards Ordinance to modify the general requirements for walls and fences so as to permit additional materials, and other matters related thereto; and

WHEREAS, the Seabrook Island Planning Commission reviewed the proposed amendments during a duly called meeting on __________, at which time the Planning Commission made a recommendation to the Mayor and Council in favor of ________ the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council advertised and held a public hearing on the proposed amendments during a duly called meeting on September 25, 2018;

NOW, THEREFORE, pursuant to the authority granted by the Constitution and the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL FOR THE TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND:

SECTION 1. Amending Section 10.60 of the Development Standards Ordinance. The Development Standards Ordinance of the Town of Seabrook Island, South Carolina; Article 10, Buffers, Landscaping and Tree Protection; Section 10.60, Specifications for Walls, Fences and Hedges; is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 10.60. - Specifications for Walls, Fences and Hedges.

§ 10.60.10. Walls or Fences. In the event a wall or fence is used or required, the following requirements shall apply:

(a) Any open spaces or non-solid areas shall be evenly spaced;

(b) The walls or fence must be made of stucco, cypress, pressure-treated wood, wood composite, brick, stone, architectural concrete masonry units (CMU), or similar materials;

(c) Fences must be made of stucco, cypress, pressure-treated wood, wood composite, iron, powder coated aluminum, or similar materials. Barbed wire, concertina wire, razor wire, chain link, poultry wire and vinyl are strictly prohibited;
(d) **Walls and fences shall be constructed with quality materials and workmanship** in accordance with prevailing building industry standards for appearance, soundness, safety and resistance to decay and weather, **and shall be maintained in good repair**;

(e) **Walls and fences shall be located no closer to a side or rear property line than fifty percent (50%) of the required side or rear setback for principal structures**;

(f) **No wall or fence shall be permitted within a required marsh or beachfront setback area**;

(g) **No wall or fence shall be taller than six (6) feet in height, measured from the finished elevation at its base to the highest point of the wall or fence; provided, however, the Planning Commission may allow a wall or fence to exceed six (6) feet in height when the wall or fence is used to screen a public building or storage yard, utility structures or equipment, or an approved outdoor storage area in a commercial or industrial district**;

(h) **Walls and fences shall not exceed a height of three (3) feet within any sight easement or clear sight triangle**;

(i) **When a wall or fence has both a finished side and an unfinished side, the finished side shall face the adjoining property or, if on the interior of the site, shall face outward toward the perimeter of the site**;

(j) **Plant materials, where required, shall be installed on the exterior side of the wall or fence; and**

(k) **Walls and fences shall not be constructed in a way that negatively impacts drainage on the site or on adjacent properties**.

§ 10.60.20. **Hedge.** Whenever a hedge is used in landscaping buildings other than single-family homes, the hedge shall be installed with plants of sufficient size and spacing as to attain the height required and opacity of at least seventy-five percent (75%) within two (2) years of planting. If a hedge is not in compliance with the above height and opacity requirements within two (2) years after planting, the hedge must be completed with mature plants at developer expense.

**SECTION 2. Severability.**

If any section, subsection, paragraph, clause, or provision of this ordinance shall be deemed to be unconstitutional, unenforceable, or otherwise invalid by the final decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, it shall be construed to have been the legislative intent of Town Council to pass said ordinance without such unconstitutional provision, and the validity of all remaining sections, subsections, paragraphs, clauses, or provisions of said ordinance shall not be affected thereby. If said ordinance, or any provision thereof, is held by the final decision of a court of competent jurisdiction to be inapplicable to any person, group of persons, property, kind of property, circumstances or set of circumstances, such holding shall not affect the applicability thereof to any other persons, property or circumstances.

**SECTION 3. Conflicting Ordinances Repealed.**
All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION 4. Effective Date.

This ordinance shall be effective upon adoption by Town Council.

SIGNED AND SEALED this _____ day of ___________________, 2018, having been duly adopted by the Town Council for the Town of Seabrook Island on the _____ day of ___________________, 2018.

First Reading: August 28, 2018
Public Hearing: September 25, 2018
Second Reading: TBD

TOWN OF SEABROOK ISLAND

__________________________________________
Ronald J. Ciancio, Mayor

ATTEST

__________________________________________
Faye Allbritton, Town Clerk