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Call to Order:

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Call to order. This is the Atlantic Beach Planning Commission meeting and public hearing for the first reading of Ordinance 7-2021. Cheryl, you wanna do roll call?

CLERK: Yeah, that's fine.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Commissioner Vereen.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: McFadden.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Derrick Stevens.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: S. Kathryn Allen.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Okay. I'd like to welcome everybody here today. Can we have a moment of silence please?

(Moment of Silence.)

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Approval of the agenda.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: So moved ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Seek a motion.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: So moved.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Okay. Approval of the minutes for the Planning Commission meeting on 9/30/2020 ---

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: And make a motion and second.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: I make a motion to approve the minutes on the Planning Commission meeting
9/30/2020.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Somebody want to second it.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: Second.

Public Hearing:

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Public Hearing 7-2021. Proposed amendment to the Town of Atlantic Beach Land Management Ordinance, Title V, Chapter 3, Article IV Zoning Districts, Division 2 Bulk, Dimensional and Density Standards to allow for the subdivision of duplexes in the R2 Residential Zoning District.

MS. COLEMAN: Mr. Chairman, do you want me to go ahead and go into the ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Yes.

MS. COLEMAN: --- explanation of this?

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Yes.

MS. COLEMAN: Okay, for those of you -- can you hear me all right?

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: Just let me know. A property owner approached staff a few months ago about the possibility of building duplexes in the R2 District. When we started looking at the zoning ordinance -- and I did a handout for you if you want to refer to it -- I've got all the
definitions straight out of the Land Management Ordinance as well as the tables. And I have a couple of packets up here if you want one of these. The definition of the R2 District -- or the description of it -- Residential R2: the intent of this district is to preserve and protect the character of Atlantic Beach neighborhoods. Residential uses range from single-family detached to multi-family at densities that are compatible with existing housing. This district may provide for innovative design including, but not limited to, zero-lot-line development. Select nonresidential uses may be allowed in this district provided such uses are complementary and do not create nuisances to residential enjoyment. So that's the title block of the zoning district. Below that I've got some of the definitions with the arrows that are color-coded for you. A duplex is considered two-family dwelling. So the definition of a duplex is a building, located on a single lot, designed or occupied exclusively by two families living independent of each other in separate dwelling units. So the question is
whether or not they could subdivide out a
duplex in the R2 District. Well, you go over
to page 2 on the handout that I made for you,
Table 5.3.420A, and you can see I've kind of
highlighted R2 -- the minimum lot size in R2
District is 6,000 square feet. You go down
below -- I highlighted a couple of different
sections because it kept going back and forth,
whether this was single-family attached or
single -- or two-family dwelling. Basically,
over to the right you can see -- I color-coded
it -- a single-family attached is usually
considered a townhome development, and they're
usually a minimum of three units and each unit
shares a wall with another one. A two-family
dwelling is a duplex. It may be side by side,
it may be up and down, depending on where
you're building it. But if you go over to the
table of uses on the right-hand side where the
red arrows are, you can see single-family
attached are conditional uses in the R
District, and that refers back to the
description that I gave you to begin with. And
a two-family -- or a duplex dwelling is a key
permitted use. So by right, currently, you can
have a duplex in the single-family R2 District. So we've established that. I added some more definitions to kind of give you more descriptions of -- so you'd have more information of what's in the ordinance. So on page 3 of your handout, I've got single-family attached -- all the information about that. Again, I've already determined that single-family attached is different than a duplex because typically there's more than three of those involved, but I did want to include the definition for zero-lot-line development. The location of a building on a lot in such a manner that one of the building's sides rests directly on the common lot line of an adjacent lot. So, we go back to the description of the R2 District where it says that zero-lot-line developments are allowed in the R2 District. On the next page, one of the problems that I saw in terms of allowing a duplex to be subdivided with the current language in the code listed Section 5.3.1023 and the title is Frontage. This is on the bottom of page 4 of the handout. Lots created hereafter shall have frontage on and access to a public street. And
no subdivision shall be approved unless the lot(s) to be subdivided shall have a minimum of 50 feet of frontage on a public street. This requirement may be reduced to 35 feet on a cul-de-sac -- and that's a design issue from an engineering standpoint -- and to 20 feet for a lot in an approved zero-lot-line development if, in the opinion of administrator, such reduction would not hinder access and all other requirements of this chapter can be met. So, I've gone from a minimum of 6,000 square feet for a duplex that's unsubdivided and normally you have to have a minimum frontage of 50 feet, now there's a place in the ordinance that allows you to reduce that minimum frontage if the zero-lot-line development is approved. So then the problem became what -- how do we handle it if they still have to have 6,000 square feet? Well, on page 6, the proposed amendment in the R2 District, we'd have to amend the minimum lot size for duplexes. So if you look at the table there -- 5.3.420A -- under R2, you still have a minimum lot area of 6,000 square feet but, when you follow it down to two-family dwellings, two-family dwellings
have a minimum of 3,000 square feet each. So the amendment to the ordinance would have to be to reduce the minimum lot area required for a duplex, but that goes back to both sides. So only duplex lots could be less than 6,000 square feet and they must have at least 3,000 square feet per duplex. So that's what you're looking at now. Do you want to make a change to the text of the ordinance to allow that to happen? And if you go back to page 5, I did include an aerial photograph and an aerial parcel layer. But the proposed language would not change the built environment in that duplexes are already allowed in the district. So you're not creating a new use, you're not changing what can go on the property, what you're changing is whether or not that property can be split out into separate ownership. And basically, from everything we've looked at up and down the coast, this is more of an ownership matter. It -- but again, it doesn't change what can go on the property. Now, the one worry I had when I first started looking at this is if we create 3,000 square foot lot minimums on either side of a duplex, then what
happens 15 years from now? What happens if a building burns? What can be built back? Well, after looking at it and analyzing it from a lot of different angles and talking to other communities, the only thing that could go back on a lot of 3,000 square feet would be half of the duplex. So, like I said, my concern was -- playing the devil's advocate -- if something were to happen to the structure, could someone go in and build a small house on a lot that may only be 25 feet wide. Realistically, no, because you can stop that at the permitting stage. Now, could they go back and build a house on the whole lot if they want to recombine the two parcels into one piece of property again? You can always combine parcels but you couldn't further subdivide it. So, this -- did that make sense? Do you have any questions? I mean the long and the short of it is the duplexes and permitted use has been a permitted use. The question is are you okay with putting up a hypothetical property line through the middle of the -- through the firewall in the duplex?

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right. That's what we're here
for. Are we good with that?

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Yeah -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: Yes.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Well, I didn't ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: You got a ---

MS. COLEMAN: Okay.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: You lost me on the 6,000 -- it's gonna remain the -- the requirement for the building of the duplex is still 6,000 ---

MS. COLEMAN: Right.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: --- square feet?

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Well ---

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: No, no ---

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: (Inaudible) ---

MS. COLEMAN: Well, no. No, it's still -- the minimum lot size for the district is still 6,000 square feet but if it's a duplex ---

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: You'll divide it ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: You can subdivide.

MS. COLEMAN: --- then you can still -- you can subdivide it out.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: But it has to be a duplex.

MS. COLEMAN: But you're gonna -- yeah, it -- so you could only split it out if they come in to permit the duplex ---
COMMISSIONER VEREEN: That's right.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: They have to have a common wall, right?

MS. COLEMAN: Right. And it has to be a firewall.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Okay. Okay.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: And the only (inaudible) so they can commit it and deed it and then ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right, and deed it ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: The minimum lot size doesn't change. The 6,000 ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Does it?

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: --- it still has to be 6,000 ---

MS. COLEMAN: It's still 6,000 square feet but ---

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: But only 3,000 ...

MS. COLEMAN: Per duplex.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Per duplex.

MS. COLEMAN: And the reason -- the reason I did it that way is 'cause if you look over just to the right of it, you see the MS1 -- or let me -- no, MS1R.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Which page are you on?

MS. COLEMAN: It's on page 2 on the table. So look at MS1R and the minimum lot size is still 7,500 square feet. But then you toggle down and you
see for single-family attached is 3,750. For multi-family, it's 3,000 square feet. So that way -- and so you can still split it out, but to have a project in -- of that sort, you have to have a minimum of 7,500 square feet. So to have a duplex, you have to have 6,000 square feet ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: At least.

MS. COLEMAN: --- but you can still split out each side of it. So, what they're looking at is when you start with it. So, we're not -- I would recommend -- and this is the way I would enforce this anywhere else -- if somebody came to me with a subdivision plat, unless they -- unless they've already got building plans approved and they're moving forward with construction of a duplex, I wouldn't split it out until we knew that they were ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: In building.

MS. COLEMAN: --- all the way to building it.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Okay.

MS. COLEMAN: Sometimes they go ahead and build them. For example, Surfside Beach -- great example -- they're building them but they don't split them out until they sell them. So a
build -- a developer'll come in and build the unit and then split 'em out and each one'll go to someone else.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: So -- but why would you say you wouldn't recommend that they split it prior? I mean, what -- why would you wait ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: 'Cause they might not build ---

MS. COLEMAN: Well, I mean, I -- just -- it's just a little level of control. I mean I still would say nothing else could go on a lot that's less 6,000 square feet in that district.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: (Inaudible) ---

MS. COLEMAN: If they're creating -- if they're creating the smaller lots, then the only thing they're gonna build on those smaller lots is a -- half of a duplex.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right.

MS. COLEMAN: So -- and that was the worries, that you didn't want to create a mechanism by which people could come in and create these small lots and then come build -- not -- I wouldn't say a tiny home, but a really reduced ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right.

MS. COLEMAN: --- a very small footprint home. And the duplex lots, you know, when you think about
a 6,000 square foot lot for two dwelling units, that's pretty small. Typ -- nine times out of ten, you're gonna do a raised-type beach house because you want to be able to park under it, you know, you want to have -- you want to have access to be able to use the property, maybe even put in a swimming pool.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: But from -- when we were talking earlier about the financing, somebody brought that up.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Yeah, I did.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Timothy. So -- I mean if you're getting ready to build the duplex -- I'm just trying to think through from a -- just a practical standpoint -- and you go for financing ---

MS. COLEMAN: We could do a letter.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: So you do a letter to bank? But the bank ---

MS. COLEMAN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: --- has the -- we have to assure the bank -- you have to assure the bank and everything that actually the Town ---

MS. COLEMAN: They'll be independently owned.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Yeah, that ---
MS. COLEMAN: Individually owned.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: --- own everything. And when you go to the bank, you actually -- both parties actually apply to get it built.

MS. COLEMAN: And they could probably -- they'd probably do it with just the zoning ordinance.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: That's right.

MS. COLEMAN: Because that's how they do it in other places.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Yeah, like if you go to like Carol Ford (inaudible), it's not nothing new, it's been going on ---

MS. COLEMAN: And honestly, I don't -- like I said, I haven't seen anybody subdivide out a lot before they built on it anyway.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Okay.

MS. COLEMAN: To date. I don't know that that would necessarily -- that it would be necessary. I think for financing side of it, they don't want to finance it for a long-term loan. They might finance for a construction loan.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: Yeah.

MS. COLEMAN: And that's probably what's gonna happen.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Yeah.
MS. COLEMAN: Which is very different from a mortgage.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Right ---

MS. COLEMAN: Like when I built my house, I took out a construction loan.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: That's right.

MS. COLEMAN: And it was much, much better terms than even I got on my mortgage, but that was just to get the house on the lot. And then before I took ownership of it, before I closed on it, we converted it to a mortgage. For the purposes of this, if they -- if someone -- if they're family members or not, whatever, they can go to the bank and say, okay, you know, we're gonna do a construction loan for the construction side of this, but the long-term plan is that I'm financing this side, I'm financing this side, which they couldn't do unless there's a property line there.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: That's right.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right.

MS. COLEMAN: That's why they -- that's why they want to be able to subdivide. And I've -- I told them earlier that after the bottom fell out of the market a few years ago, we started
seeing up and down the coast a lot fewer condos/townhomes/apartments being built because they had to be fully financed before they could go with, you know, to do them, they had to sell an entire project out of townhomes before a contractor would come in and do it. Things are a little bit friendlier now but ...

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: You had a question, Jay?

MS. DIVINE: So I had some examples for the Planning Commission of duplexes on lots that are 50 foot wide or larger ---

MS. COLEMAN: Uh-huh.

MS. DIVINE: --- two units. So I brought some examples of that. And I did have some conversations, of course, with the lenders, which is why I put in the request to have the ordinance reviewed.

MS. COLEMAN: Uh-huh.

MS. DIVINE: Because the lenders will finance the construction because the building has to be erected at one time ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right.

MS. DIVINE: --- even if it's two units.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right.

MS. DIVINE: So the two parties -- Party A and Party
COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: Agreed.

MS. DIVINE: --- can be on the construction loan together. At the end, when you go to refinance into your long-term 30-year mortgage, you cannot have the two parties with one ownership of the unit. It has to have -- it has to be split. So, you could split it at that time ---

MS. COLEMAN: Uh-huh.

MS. DIVINE: --- or you could split it before. The bank didn't care when it was split, but by the time you go to get your permanent loan, it has to be split 'cause they can't have two owners across the land and separate owners on the buildings. So that's -- that was what brought up the request to begin with because the long-term problem will be a title issue. If I own Unit A and my friend owned Unit B, and I want to leave and bequeath my unit to someone ---

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Couldn't do it.

MS. DIVINE: --- I would not be able to if we both were owners ---

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: That's right.

MS. DIVINE: --- on the land so that's why the land had to be subdivided and Ms. Coleman saw the
issue if -- the problem was solved with the property line ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right.

MS. DIVINE: --- the firewall being the property line.

MS. COLEMAN: And you're gonna build -- in all honesty, you're gonna build a firewall on a duplex anyway ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Got to. You've got to ---

MS. COLEMAN: --- for protection purposes.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: You've got to.

MS. COLEMAN: But again, we saw this coming. I've been here 28 years, and we saw this coming years ago in different areas like in unincorporated Horry County where people were building -- starting to -- building duplexes, that they could -- they could maximize what they could have on the property in terms of being able to build a decent size unit but still maintain individual ownerships. And so, to start with, we saw them coming in and requesting variances. And to be honest, under state law, they didn't meet any hardships because you can use financing, or any financial thing, for a hardship under state law for
variances. So, we went back and looked at it and again, it -- if you didn't already allow duplexes in that district, I may have had some heartburn by saying, oh, well, we're introducing something different but again, I read you the intent statement for the R2. R2 even allows multi-family. So again, you're not increasing the potential density, you're not increasing the potential number of units, you're just allowing those duplexes to be split out and owned fee simple.

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: And if you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Do you have any more of these?

MS. COLEMAN: No, but I can send some more out if you have ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: --- somebody can have this one.

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: I can get you one too.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Thank you.

MS. COLEMAN: I will. I apologize. I printed a few ---

MS. DIVINE: This isn't my plan, everybody. This is
just a plan ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Okay, that's ---

MS. DIVINE: --- yeah, any duplex plan ---

MS. COLEMAN: I just tried to make it a little bit easier to see ---

MS. DIVINE: --- and then I put some examples to show ---

MS. COLEMAN: And the other thing is your active -- I did include your zoning map because -- just as a reminder that you do have a lot of R2 here but, again, if they don't meet the minimum standards to qualify for a duplex anyway ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: You can't do it.

MS. COLEMAN: --- then they wouldn't be able to split it out necessarily, or they might not be able to build a duplex on it. But this -- the use is already permitted.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Okay.

MS. COLEMAN: It's just whether or not you can split it and have single ownership.

(Inaudible background noise.)

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: So now, if one part of the duplex burned down hypothetically, the replacement has to be a 3,000 square foot attached unit ---

MS. COLEMAN: Well, I mean on the 3,000 square foot
lot but, yeah, it would be an attached unit but
---

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Well, my question is ---
MS. COLEMAN: Uh-huh.
MR. QUATTLEBAUM: --- if part of the building burned
---
MS. COLEMAN: Uh-huh.
MR. QUATTLEBAUM: --- hypothetical situation -- and
the separate -- you've got separate ownerships,
can the new owner, purchaser of the property,
build a separate, individual unit?
MS. COLEMAN: I would say no.
VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: No ---
MS. COLEMAN: Because the minimum lot area for
single-family is 6,000 square feet ---
MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Okay.
MS. COLEMAN: --- the only exception is for a
duplex.
MR. QUATTLEBAUM: So, it would have to be ---
MS. COLEMAN: Yes ---
MR. QUATTLEBAUM: --- back to being a duplex.
MS. COLEMAN: Right. And the two-family is, by
definition, a shared wall or -- again, I threw
in there that you can have an up and down
duplex too. I lived in one of those before.
But there's a fire separation floor-ceiling in those though.

MR. BOOKER: I've got a question.

MS. COLEMAN: Yes, sir?

MR. BOOKER: I'm sorry. It's a little late (inaudible) but -- so if I have a lot ---

MS. COLEMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. BOOKER: --- the only way I could get 3,000 square feet per property is to build a duplex when I subdivide. How can I subdivide and build ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: No.

MR. BOOKER: --- part of a duplex? I've gotta build the whole thing to start ---

MS. COLEMAN: Well, I mean, you wouldn't need to subdivide it if you're not building a duplex ---

MR. BOOKER: Right. I understand ---

MS. COLEMAN: --- so that -- yeah, if you build a duplex, you can subdivide it.

MR. BOOKER: I can?

MS. COLEMAN: Yeah.

MR. BOOKER: But the only way that it can be subdivided is that I'm building a duplex on it?

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: That's right.
MS. COLEMAN: Unless you're -- unless you've got more than 6,000 square feet and you want to -- you're doing a multi-family unit like townhomes, but the same thing applies, that has to go through review and be improved in that area. That's a conditional use.

MR. BOOKER: Right.

MS. COLEMAN: The duplex is a by-right use, meaning anybody that has an R2 lot that meets the minimums ---

MR. BOOKER: Uh-huh.

MS. COLEMAN: --- can have a duplex. The change now is that if they have a -- if they're building a duplex, then they can split it out fee simple.

MR. BOOKER: Right.

MS. COLEMAN: But if you -- you wouldn't -- you wouldn't be able to just subdivide the lot ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: --- and that was my first concern. When I started looking at this, I said oh, am I opening a ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: And you can -- I showed them that little -- the little handout I gave you. I
think it was on page 5. There's a map, aerial map and a parcel map, that -- that on the bottom of those slides, there are numbers on there that ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: --- that shows -- and keep in mind on that map, the lines are a little bit off because when they made those maps, they don't look down directly, perfectly perpendicular 90 degrees so they're kind of at an angle so some of those lines are a little bit off. But you can see that some of the duplexes are on a single lot, some of the duplexes have been split. So, some people build a duplex for an investment and rent it out at the beach. Some people build a duplex, split it out and sell each half, they may live in one, you know. But anyway, you can see there's a variation on it. It's not ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MR. BOOKER: Can I ask one final question ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. BOOKER: What's the rules against ---

(Inaudible background noise.)
MS. COLEMAN: There are existing lots ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: --- so if they're in R2 District, you still -- there are some allowances in the ordinance so if you're -- are they substandard, are they less than 6,000 square feet?

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: Well, that's -- that one has a different -- has different requirements. So, anything that is a legal lot of record to a certain extent should be able to handle almost anything that the zoning ordinance allows, but you still have to meet the requirements for setbacks, although we may be able to reduce those slightly because it's a substandard lot. You can't really impose the same setbacks on those lots. Usually, you can ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: --- but if it's commercial, you still have parking requirements, you still have landscaping requirements but, if you've got a legal lot of record, the Town's not gonna say you can use that lot 'cause some of these lots that are on here, there are a very few that are -- there's a couple of tiny, tiny lots that are
between 31st and 32nd that look to be landlocked. Not sure what could happen with those, those probably need to be recombined but they may be in separate ownership, they may be heir properties where the properties were split out between different family members but -- but they're a tiny little square ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

**MS. COLEMAN:** --- but as it happens, if you think, you know, if you've got an (inaudible) lot and you want to build a single-family, we can work with you. If you want to build duplex, then we would look at it and see -- make sure that we can meet the minimum standards. And the big worry was -- the first thing was, how are you gonna deal with the minimum frontage requirements because I've watched that happen. Horry County, the Board of Zoning Appeals was rarely granting variances to allow the property lines to be put in, and then we'd get the plat in and they didn't meet the minimum frontage for a lot so they had to go back to Board of Zoning Appeals and ask for forgiveness. In this case, you've already got something in the ordinance that allows you to reduce it to 25
VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: All right.

(inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: I'm not sure what those tiny, little lots are. Again, they might be the same family. They -- you don't know. It'd be hard to ---

(inaudible background noise.)

MS. COLEMAN: Does that answer most of your questions or ... I tried to keep it as simple as I could.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: We appreciate ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: I understand.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: I was just concerned about the limit to the split, like that there would not be a chance that you could build a duplex ---

MS. COLEMAN: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: --- as a one-person and then want to go -- separate it and it could be stopped. That's we said maybe ---

MS. COLEMAN: Well, you still have the building code requirements so, you know, somebody -- you can't just come in and build on it, you've gotta get permits and everything else. So you still have -- there's a whole 'nother layer.
I'm talking from a zoning standpoint, although I did bring up the building code and the fire code when I talked about the firewall, but I always bring that up because that's exceptionally important. You know, that was one thing, when we had -- people started first subdividing these out in different parts of the county, the first thing they had to do was prove that it was built with a firewall because otherwise they couldn't split it so that's an important part of it, but this is the first layer of trying to do this. If they meet the zoning, then they go forward and, you know, they have to submit plans and all those have to be approved. But meeting zoning is the hurdle ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: That's right.

MS. COLEMAN: --- because you can always make the building plans work.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Okay.

New Business:

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: We're on New Business, Ordinance 7-2021, Text Amendment to the Town of Atlantic Beach LMO, Title V, Article IV, Zoning Districts, Division 2 Bulk, Dimensional and
Density Standards to allow for the subdivision of duplexes in the R2 zoning district. Seek a motion to ...

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Motion to approve.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Yeah. Motion to ---

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: Second the motion?

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: I'll second it.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: It's been seconded. Public Comments - General. Any comments?

MS. DIVINE: Yes.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Did you all take a vote? You gotta take a vote.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Oh. Do the vote, Cheryl.

(Inaudible background noise.)

CLERK: Roll call. Commissioner Derrick Stevens?

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Yes.

CLERK: Commissioner Timothy Vereen?

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: I agree.

CLERK: Commissioner Esco McFadden?

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: Yes.

CLERK: Commissioner Kathryn Allen?

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: I do, yes.

Public Comments:
VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: That's it. You've got a comment?

MS. DIVINE: I do. I just wanted to share just a minute or two with the public and the Commission on some of the examples that (inaudible). Thanks for giving me a moment. So when we checked -- my husband and I -- around the town and we were looking to create opportunities for other family and friends, this opportunity on the west side near the highway and 32nd Avenue presented itself, and we saw that there weren't duplexes in the town which would give more family members an opportunity to own property. And the only limitation was the ownership of each duplex having to remain encumbered by two people. And so none of us wanted to create a tangled title issue, which I understand is a problem already in Atlantic Beach with many of the properties not being able to -- errors and things of that -- they have difficulties sometimes in title when you go to convey property. So I just wanted to point out that the only impact to this ordinance is the ownership. And as Ms. Coleman pointed, it already allows for duplexes
to be built and the size -- 'cause I hear Mr. Quattlebaum asking and I think I've heard some other concerns in the town about the building structure is not what's in question ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right.

MS. DIVINE: --- the building structure is going to be based on what the ordinance already allows. The height restrictions are what the ordinance allows. The only change is gonna be the ownership of the land, and that will allow everyone to own their house and the land beneath it. And that's only to -- I wanted to show you that there were different types of duplexes that -- these are all Horry County duplexes that I took pictures of or found on the Internet and downloaded so you could see they're different sizes. There's no real limitation on the size of the duplex, but all of them are not gonna be more than 20 feet wide ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right.

MS. DIVINE: --- because you have the ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Setbacks.

MS. DIVINE: --- setback on the side and you had that (inaudible) wall and the 20 foot width is
the restriction, and you do go up I think 45 feet or ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Right.

MS. DIVINE: --- 35 feet. So I just wanted you to see there were some two-story ones and some one-story ones, they're probably 3,000 square feet or less, some of them, so there wasn't a size restriction of the building. I just wanted to make sure that everybody was clear on that. And that was it. We did do our diligence and we checked with financing, and the challenge was the Town allowed us to do something that the banks wouldn't support which you're stifled and you can't move forward. So that was it. Thank you, all.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: All right ---

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Mr. Booker?

MR. BOOKER: Do I have to come up? Do I have to ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Come on.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Need in front of the recorder so they can pick you up ---

MR. BOOKER: Okay. Do I have to limit my comments to this ---
CLERK: No, go ahead.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Well ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MR. BOOKER: Okay. Well, good afternoon, Commissioners, Town Manager and Cheryl, citizens and Waccamaw. I'd like to talk about in this resolution or ordinance that was passed out, it says in this ordinance -- it says whereas the Town Council provides and encourages more residential development within the Town including duplexes. So I think we all support that whereas. I'm bringing this up because there is a parcel, a section of the town, that's zoned that doesn't necessarily support that requirement but it already has residential in it. I'm speaking about the ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MR. BOOKER: --- land that's zoned WF2 between 30th and 31st Avenues and Ocean Boulevard and Seaview. Now, in that block, there are six -- well, actually there are four lots, four pieces of property. One on the corner that's vacant at 31st and -- between Ocean and Seaview, the vacant lot. And then there's Gibson's property. There's all that property, all
(inaudible). And there's Pierce's property and the late Fox Gore's property. And then there's a big parcel on the end. It's a -- it's actually a three-lot parcel but it's really one parcel now because they've all been combined. And there is -- and those -- that property -- particularly that three-lot parcel was -- in the prior zoning, prior to -- you all were just passing this most recent land management ordinance, that property at that time only permitted commercial development, and it sat there without any development from whenever that ordinance was put in place -- 2003 or '04 or something like that -- all the way up until you all modified this land management ordinance, and it's still sitting there. And so, there is a potential to get some residential development in that area. I happen to know the lady who owns the lot on the end at 31st Street end, and she desires to build a residential property there but the zoning doesn't permit it. I happen to know that there's some people interested in getting that property that's owned by the Coopers who would like to make residential units there,
recognizing that there are already residential units in that block. And so, what we're talking about doing with the current zoning is bringing in some commercial developments and putting it beside the long-term Atlantic Beach property owners who have residential units there and from my experience of dealing with them and others, they have no intention of going anywhere. And so, I'm just bringing this up because I would like for you all to consider the potential of allowing residential development in that block. I'm not saying that we ought to rezone it 'cause I don't really know what the options are or if there are any options at all, but I think when we have the opportunity to bring in four residential developments similar to the ones that we have recently had in the town, as opposed to waiting for someone to come along who wants to develop it commercially, recognizing it's been sitting there uncommercially developed for more than 20 years and we have people who really want to develop residentially. And I know that our vision for the town is to have commercial development but when you've got residential
developers who are gonna build half a million
dollar homes or better, so you've got two
million dollars worth of development waiting on
a bigger development, that's like drawing to an
inside straight to me. So I'm just bringing
this up as a concern and an opportunity for us
to ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MR. BOOKER: --- town desires to encourage more
residential development. We may be able to get
that development with some level of flexibility
in that particular block. And I'm not asking
about all of that WF2 zone, but I'm speaking
about that on in particular which is already
half developed residential.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: You said WF1 or WF2?

MR. BOOKER: It's WF2 ---

MS. COLEMAN: It's two.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Two, okay.

MR. BOOKER: Yes ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: WF2 ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MR. BOOKER: And so, half of the block is already --

(Inaudible background noise.)
MS. COLEMAN: And just to clarify, it does allow residential, but the condition is (inaudible) be above a commercial ---

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: That's one of those places ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Two people have built houses that way already ---

MS. COLEMAN: --- something we can look at is look at the existing development that, if there is existing residential development, that you may be able to have some consideration because if you look at it under the zoning ordinance that I gave you with the table of uses so -- the one that's 5.3.502 I think it is -- in the WF1 and WF2, you see Ss down the -- down that column. That means special exception. So that could be something you could add to say, you've got to get a special exception to do residential development, then you're gonna have to go in front of a Board of Zoning Appeals anyway ---

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: So if they bring it to us, they actually could get ---

MS. COLEMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. BOOKER: Right. And so, the thing is, I just want to -- and I don't want to belabor this, but the thing is the people who want to develop
are not necessarily interested in putting in commercial on the ground floor because the current requirement is that 50 percent of the ground floor has to be some resort-focused or commercial-type use, and so I don't, I mean, from what I know, that's not their interest. They want to build a nice home, a nice place that -- at least a half a million dollars, probably more ---

(Inaudible background noise.)

MR. BOOKER: --- houses for half a million dollars, now, we might talking about three million dollars worth of investment that we're holding off waiting on a big commercial investment, and I just want to put that on the table for (inaudible), okay ---

MS. COLEMAN: Uh-huh ---

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Okay, sir.

MR. BOOKER: --- I don't -- I'm not looking for an answer. It's just I think there's an opportunity for us to come -- to bring this statement of where we encourage residential development more to life and it's beneficial to everybody because I know there's a bunch in the town, I mean, we like this residential
development and I think many of us would be happy with all residential, but I know there's a desire to have commercial. I'd like to have that too, but -- and that's all. That's my point.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Yes, sir. Thank you for the --

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: Thank you.

MS. COLEMAN: I understand that. Just from a zoning standpoint, what he's saying is completely reasonable. And again, I told Mr. Quattlebaum this, I know that the Waccamaw Regional Council of Governments wrote -- created this document. This is your document. This belongs to the Town. So any time you want to make changes or amend it or ... I'm, you know, I'll do what I can to help you research it and find out, you know, what works and what doesn't. I can tell you from looking at it that whoever did this -- and I'm thinking it was -- Mr. Britton probably wrote it. But the highest and best use of the property, the most valuable use of the property, would be for it developed commercially. That may not be what the property owner thinks though so I can
understand if somebody wants to do something different -- no problem.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: All right.

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Mr. Chairman, and I just want to add to the conversation I'm in support of development in the town. The only concern I raise -- and I shared with Mr. Booker when he raised the question with me -- is in terms of the cost, administrative cost, for the Town in any modifications to zoning for changes. And going through the process that we did of -- I don't know how many months it took to get the LMO updated -- we had legal opinions on top that, costs. We did a modification to Zone R2 on 29th and 32nd. All of that is creating administrative costs for the Town. That's all. I just want to caution the Commission. But I am in support and in favor of development in the Town, but we have to be cognizant of those costs and -- in our deliberation and decisions around these items.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: So, Mr. Quattlebaum ---

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: Mr. Quattlebaum.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: No, go ahead.
COMMISSIONER ALLEN: So I just want to make sure I understand what you're saying. So if the cost that you're talking about would apply if we actually rezoned that space versus like if someone applied for a special exception, that would not have the same cost to it, right?

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: The special exception I don't think would have the same process ---

MS. COLEMAN: It'd be similar. Yeah, this -- in terms of state law---

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: --- the process.

MS. COLEMAN: State law still requires you to notify property owners and have a public hearing, and some of the costs are that you post properties, that you have to put an ad in the paper, you know, bringing staff in -- although we're on a retainer right now. But state law does allow you to charge fees for administrative changes ---

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: That's what I was going to say.

MS. COLEMAN: --- and those fees should be somewhat commensurate with what you're putting into it to allow that to happen.

COMMISSIONER VEREEN: And that's what I was gonna
ask, like, do you -- if you know how much the costs are, I know you know the City of North Myrtle or Myrtle Beach, if you go to get something rezoned, it's a fee for it. So that -- but the owner actually, when they go to apply, they pay for that. So if we do come up with a fee and then you just charge the owner that fee for a rezoning fee ---

MR. QUATTLEBAUM: Yeah ---

COMMISSIONER VEREEEN: --- and it pays for the signs, it pays for ---

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Everything.

COMMISSION VEREEEN: --- administrative costs, everything. So it takes it off the Town's ---

MS. COLEMAN: And the Council can establish the fee schedule ---

COMMISSIONER McFADDEN: That's right.

COMMISSIONER VEREEEN: So, if you get us some numbers on what you think it costs for administrative fees, we can vote on that and come up with a fee.

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Let's end the meeting. Can we do it?

(Inaudible background noise.)

VICE-CHAIR STEVENS: Meeting adjourned.
(There being nothing further, the commission meeting and public hearing was adjourned.)
TOWN OF ATLANTIC BEACH
2022-2023 REZONING SUBMITTAL DEADLINES AND MEETING SCHEDULE

The Planning Commission is scheduled to meet on the third Thursday of each month at the Atlantic Beach Community Center at 1 pm. These meetings are open to the public. These meetings are subject to cancellation should there be no business to conduct.

Rezoning Applications shall be submitted at least 45 calendar days prior to the Planning Commission Public Hearing to allow for a formal staff review and to provide adequate public notice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Submission Deadline</th>
<th>Planning Commission Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2023</td>
<td>December 5, 2022</td>
<td>January 19, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2023</td>
<td>January 2, 2023</td>
<td>February 16, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2023</td>
<td>January 30, 2023</td>
<td>March 16, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2023</td>
<td>March 6, 2023</td>
<td>April 20, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2023</td>
<td>April 3, 2023</td>
<td>May 18, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2023</td>
<td>May 1, 2023</td>
<td>June 15, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2023</td>
<td>June 5, 2023</td>
<td>July 20, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2023</td>
<td>July 3, 2023</td>
<td>August 17, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2023</td>
<td>August 7, 2023</td>
<td>September 21, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2023</td>
<td>September 4, 2023</td>
<td>October 19, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2023</td>
<td>October 2, 2023</td>
<td>November 16, 2023 (a week prior due to Thanksgiving holiday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2023</td>
<td>November 6, 2023</td>
<td>December 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOWN OF ATLANTIC BEACH
PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION MEMO
RE: Bulk, Dimensional & Density Standards
February 16, 2023

ISSUE
Should the district bulk, dimensional & density standards be modified to support infill development and reduce the prevalence of nonconforming lots?

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends approval.

BACKGROUND
The Land Management Ordinance was adopted in 2019 to support the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan and the 2007 Master Plan. Numerous property owners have identified challenges to being able to develop their lots, as they are currently non-conforming because their lots are undersized for their zoning district or the setback requirements severely restrict their development.

ANALYSIS
The following revisions are incorporated into this proposed text amendment to ensure existing lots can be developed, while maintaining the intent of the districts and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan:

Revised the intent for the Main Street 1 (MS1) District. This change is to clarify that allowed residential uses can be located to the rear and upper levels of retail, office, and dining establishments when a mixture of uses are incorporated into one building or lot.

Clarified that Multi-family is allowed in the MS1 District. Added MS1 to Section 5.3.55 and clarified that it is allowed as a standalone use or to the rear and upper levels.

Reduced the minimum lot width in the Residential (R2) District. Reduced the minimum lot width from 50 ft to 35 ft to accommodate infill development in this district. The minimum lot size will remain the same.

Reduced the minimum lot area for the Single-family attached uses in the R2 District. This is to be consistent with the standards for two-family dwellings (duplexes). They are effectively the same use; however, a single-family attached use can be subdivided.

Removed Two-Family dwellings (duplexes) from the dimensional standards for the MS1 District. This corrects a scrivenor’s error, as duplexes are not an allowed use in this district.

Reduced of minimum lot size in the Main Street 1 (MS1), Main Street 1 Residential (MS1R), and Main Street 2 (MS2) districts. Currently, a significant number of these lots are smaller
than the 7,500 sq ft minimum required for these districts. Reducing the minimum lot size to 7,000 sq ft will address the majority of these non-conforming lots.

**Reduced the rear setbacks for lots greater than 8,000 sq ft in the Main Street 1 (MS1), Main Street 1 Residential (MS1R), and Main Street 2 (MS2) districts.** As currently written, if lots are less than 8,000 sq ft in these districts, only a 15 ft rear setback is required. If over 8,000 sq ft, the rear setback significantly increases to 60 ft. This significant increase discourages the combination of lots in these districts, which would be necessary to support larger scale development, such as multi-family, commercial, or mixed use developments. These districts are intended to create a main street character and central business district within the Town; however, the current setbacks do not support the intent. This amendment proposes to reduce the rear setback to 30 ft for lots over 8,000 sq ft. This will still protect the surrounding properties in the R2 districts that abut them, while ensuring the lots in these districts can more feasibly be developed.
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF HORRY  
TOWN OF ATLANTIC BEACH  

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE LAND MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE TO MODIFY THE DISTRICT BULK, DIMENSIONAL & DENSITY STANDARDS TO SUPPORT INFILL DEVELOPMENT AND REDUCE THE PREVELANCE OF NONCONFORMING LOTS.

WHEREAS, The Town of Atlantic Beach is empowered to amend its ordinances from time to time, and to update its zoning ordinance and Comprehensive Plan consistent with state law and the changing needs of the Town, in its best interests, after review by the Town Planning Commission, public notice, and public hearing; and

WHEREAS, South Carolina Code § 6-29-310 empowers an appointed municipal planning commission to hear and make recommendations on zoning ordinance changes; and,

WHEREAS, the Land Management Ordinance does not clearly define mixed-use design standards in the Main Street 1 (MS1) District; and,

WHEREAS, the Bulk, Dimensional & Density Standards defined in the Land Management Ordinance render many lots to be non-conforming, thus limiting their development potential; and,

NOW, THEREFORE, be it enacted and ordained by the Town Council of the Town of Atlantic Beach by the power and authority granted by the State of South Carolina that the Town of Atlantic Beach Zoning Ordinance is hereby amended as follows:

1) Amendment to Article IV. Zoning Districts, Division 1. Districts in General, Section 5.3.401.3 of the Land Management Ordinance. The Land Management Ordinance is hereby amended with all text shown underlined and bolded shall be added.

5.2.401.3 Main Street 1 (MS1). The intent of this district is to provide and encourage a mixture of uses. Single uses are allowed to promote and ease infill development. Permitted uses include neighborhood scale (less than 20,000) retail and office uses as well as multi-family and transient residential uses. When mixed-use development is utilized in the same building or lot, residential uses shall be located to the rear or upper levels.

2) Amendment to Article V. Use Regulations, Division 2. Specific Use Standards, Section 5.3.555 of the Land Management Ordinance. The Land Management Ordinance is hereby amended with all text in strikethrough shall be deleted and all text shown underlined and bolded shall be added. Multi-family dwellings are permitted in the MS1, MS2, HWY, WF1, and WF2 districts as second floor or upper story residences. Multi-family shall also be permitted as
standalone use in the MS1 district. Multi-family dwellings shall also be permitted on the first floor of mixed-use structures in the MS1 district, provided the dwellings have their primary access from the side or rear of the building. Multi-family dwellings in these districts are also subject to the requirements of Section 5.3.570.

3) Amendment to Article IV. Zoning Districts, Division 2. Bulk, Dimensional, and Density Standards, Section 5.3.420, Table 5.3.420A of the Land Management Ordinance. The Land Management Ordinance is hereby amended with all text in strikethrough shall be deleted and all text shown underlined and bolded shall be added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS</th>
<th>DISTRICTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area (in square feet)</td>
<td>CP R2 MS1 MS1R MS2 G HWY WF1 WF2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6,000 7,500 7,500 7,500 7,500 7,500 15,000 22,500 22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width (in feet)</td>
<td>None 50 50 50 50 50 100 150 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Structure Height</td>
<td>45 feet and no more than 3 stories 55 feet and no more than 5 stories 55 feet and no more than 5 stories 85 feet and no more than 8 stories 55 feet and no more than 5 stories 55 feet and no more than 5 stories 55 feet and no more than 5 stories 125 feet and no more than 12 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Coverage</td>
<td>40% 60% 50% 70% 60% 60% 45% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage</td>
<td>40% 60% 50% 70% 65% 70% 45% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Open Space</td>
<td>100% 55% 30% 40% 20% 20% 20% 45% 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>1.75 .75 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (minimum lot area in square feet per dwelling unit)</td>
<td>Single-Family, attached 6,000 3,750 Single-Family, detached 6,000 4,500 Two-Family Dwellings 3,000 3,750 1,500 Multi-Family 6,000 2,500 3,000 2,000 2,000 3,000 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARDS</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (in feet) by Abutting Street/Feature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanfront</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue S.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue S.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue S.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue S.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Street Frontages</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (in feet) for Building Heights Above 35 Feet by Abutting Street/Feature (where applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue S.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue S.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue S.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Avenue S.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Hwy 17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (in feet) for Building Heights Above 45 Feet by Abutting Street/Feature (where applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanfront</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5.3.420A
District BULK, Dimensional & Density Standards (1)(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>MS1</th>
<th>MS1R</th>
<th>MS2</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>HWY</th>
<th>WF1</th>
<th>WF2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th Avenue S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th Avenue S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st Avenue S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd Avenue S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Side Yard Setback</strong> (in feet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots up to 8,000 square feet in area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 8,000 to 15,999 square feet in area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 16,000 square feet in area or greater</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Yard Setback</strong> (in feet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots less than 8,000 square feet in area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 8,000 square feet or greater in area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
(1) WF1 and WF2 properties may be eligible for designation as a Flexible Design District. This designation provides alternate height, coverage, FAR, and density standards.
(2) At structure heights of 45 feet and greater, the front yard setback (oceanfront) in the WF1 and WF2 districts is 60 feet. The oceanfront setback for lots northeast of 29th Avenue South and southeast of 32nd Avenue South is 5 feet, irrespective of height.
(3) At structure heights of 45 feet and greater, the side yard setback in the WF1 and WF2 districts is increased to a distance equal to the front yard setback applicable to the lot.
SEVERABILITY. If any provision, clause, sentence, or paragraph of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this ordinance, which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and any such provisions are declared to be severable. All ordinances or parts thereof inconsistent with this ordinance are repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon adoption at second reading.

BE IT ORDERED AND ORDAINED by the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Atlantic Beach, South Carolina, in assembly and by the authority thereof, this _______ day of _____________, 2023.

Atlantic Beach Town Council

_____________________________________
Mayor, Jake Evans

_____________________________________
Councilmember, Edward Campbell

_____________________________________
Councilmember, Jacqueline Gore

_____________________________________
Councilmember, Josephine Isom

Attest:

_____________________________________
Town Clerk

_____________________________________
Town Manager
ISSUE
Should the parking requirements in the Main Street 1 (MS1) and Main Street 2 (MS2) Districts be reduced to encourage infill, mixed-use development?

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends approval.

BACKGROUND
The Land Management Ordinance was adopted in 2019 to support the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan and the 2007 Master Plan. Numerous property owners along 30th Avenue have identified that existing parking standards are limiting the ability to develop their properties because the small size of their lots cannot feasibly incorporate the parking requirements, in addition to the impervious limits and open space requirements.

ANALYSIS
The Land Management Ordinance requires that the number of parking spaces in mixed-use developments equal the sum of the requirements of the various uses computed separately.

The MS1 and MS2 districts are intended to support mixed-uses, such as dining, retail and/or offices in conjunction with residential or transient uses on the same lot or within the same structure. The intent of these districts is to foster the development of a central business district/main street along 30th Ave S (Atlantic St) and portions of 31st Ave S (Carolina St) and 2nd Ave (Seaview St).

The lots within the MS1 and MS2 districts are typically 7,000-7,500 sq ft in size. When the parking, open space, and impervious coverage limits are taken into consideration, the development of the lots in these districts become severely limited. In order to encourage infill, mixed-use development and reduce the need for variance requests, this amendment proposes to reduce the parking requirements in half for non-residential and non-accommodation uses within the MS1 and MS2 districts if a property is developed as mixed use development. All other non-residential and non-accommodation uses in these districts will have a twenty-five percent parking reduction.
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )
COUNTY OF HORRY )
TOWN OF ATLANTIC BEACH )

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE LAND MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE TO MODIFY THE PARKING REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT INFILL, MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT.

WHEREAS, The Town of Atlantic Beach is empowered to amend its Land Management Ordinance to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the changing needs of the Town, in its best interests, after review by the Town Planning Commission, public notice, and public hearing; and

WHEREAS, South Carolina Code § 6-29-310 empowers an appointed municipal planning commission to hear and make recommendations on zoning ordinance changes; and,

WHEREAS, Off-street parking requirements limit the feasibility of infill, mixed use development in the Main Street 1 (MS1) and Main Street 2 (MS2) district; and,

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission recommends that off-street parking requirements of the Land Management Ordinance be revised to promote the creation of a main street, as intended by the Comprehensive Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it enacted and ordained by the Town Council of the Town of Atlantic Beach by the power and authority granted by the State of South Carolina that the Town of Atlantic Beach Zoning Ordinance is hereby amended as follows:

1) Amendment to Article VI. Supplemental Zoning Standards, Division 3. Parking and Loading Standards. Section 5.3.630 of the Land Management Ordinance. The Land Management Ordinance is hereby amended with all text shown underlined and bolded shall be added and for the definition to be placed in alphabetical order within this section.

DIVISION 3. PARKING AND LOADING STANDARDS

SECTION 5.3.630 Off-Street Parking Required

A. Off-street parking shall be provided for all uses hereafter established (including a change of use for an existing building or structure) or at such time any building or structure is erected, enlarged, or increased in capacity. Permanent off-street parking shall be provided, at a minimum, in accordance with Table 5.3.630A “Parking Chart” and Table 5.3.502 “Schedule of Uses.”
### Table 5.3.630A

**PARKING CHART**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING CODE</th>
<th>MINIMUM PARKING SPACES REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Two (2) spaces per dwelling unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>One and one half (1 ½) spaces per dwelling unit plus an additional .25 spaces for each additional bedroom above one (1) and one-half (1/2) spaces per lock-out room (where permitted).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>One (1) space per bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>One (1) space for each 100 square feet of gross floor area (including areas devoted to outdoor dining) plus space to accommodate the stacking of four (4) vehicles where drive-thru facilities are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>One (1) space for each 200 square feet of gross floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>One (1) space for each 225 square feet of gross floor area plus space to accommodate all service vehicles used in connection therewith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>One (1) space for each room to be rented plus 75 percent of the parking required for other uses associated with the establishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>One (1) space for each four (4) seats in the main assembly room or one (1) per every thirty (30) square feet of floor area in the main assembly room, whichever is greater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>One (1) space for each four (4) seats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>One (1) space for each 200 square feet of office area plus four (4) spaces for each service bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>One (1) space for each three (3) persons that the facility is designed to accommodate when fully utilized, plus one (1) space per 200 square feet of gross floor area used for office or similar activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Four (4) spaces for each driving tee or green, three (3) spaces for each basketball and tennis court, one and one-half (1 ½) spaces per employee during maximum seasonal employment, and one (1) space per each 10,000 square feet of lot area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>One (1) space for each 1,000 square feet of lot area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Two (2) spaces per classroom (elementary schools), five (5) spaces per classroom (junior high) and ten (10) spaces per classroom (high school, college, or other).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Five (5) spaces per each doctor or dentist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>One (1) space for each four (4) seats in the chapel or parlor, plus one (1) space for each 200 square feet of office area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>One (1) space for each two (2) patient beds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Two (2) spaces per bed, plus one (1) space per 200 square feet of office area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>One (1) space per each 500 square feet of gross floor area, plus one (1) space per every three (3) employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>One (1) space per employee plus one (1) space per every five (5) children or adults enrolled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>One (1) space for each 200 square feet of office or waiting area plus two (2) spaces for each service bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Ten (10) spaces per wash unit for automatic wash, plus five (5) spaces per wash area for manual wash. Note: Off-street vehicle stacking space may be used to satisfy this requirement, if the plan is acceptable to the Administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Two (2) spaces per fuel pump plus one (1) space per each 300 square feet of floor area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. In determining required parking spaces, the following shall apply:

1. The parking codes, as provided in Table 5.3.630A, are assigned to the various uses by Table 5.3.502 “Schedule of Uses;”

2. In cases of mixed or joint uses, the parking spaces required shall equal the sum of the requirements of the various uses computed separately; and

3. Where a fractional space results, any fraction less than one-half (1/2) may be dropped and any fraction of one-half (1/2) or more shall be counted as one (1) parking space.

4. In the MS1 and MS2 Districts, off-street parking requirements may be reduced by twenty-five (25) percent for all non-residential and non-accommodation uses. In cases of mixed or joint uses, off-street parking requirements may be reduced by fifty (50) percent for all non-residential and non-accommodation uses.

SECTION 5.3.631 Maximum Off-Street Parking

Permanent off-street parking shall not exceed 105 percent of the minimum number of spaces required for a land use. This section shall not apply to single-family and two-family dwellings.

SECTION 5.3.632 Exception to Minimum and Maximum Parking Standards

A. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sections 5.3.630 and 5.3.631, the Administrator may accept a higher or lower number of parking spaces than required by this Division based on developer-submitted parking data such as a shared parking analysis or appropriate standards from another accepted source.

B. The shared parking analysis shall follow the guidelines of the Urban Land Institute’s Shared Parking report. Any shared or off-site parking to be utilized shall require the recording of a perpetual easement, in form and substance acceptable to the Administrator, in the office of the Register of Deeds of Horry County.

C. If the Administrator accepts a lower number of parking spaces than is required in Section 5.3.630, the site may be required to accommodate the higher number of spaces otherwise required in case of future need. The design and location of these additional parking spaces shall meet the following site design standards:

1. The area necessary to accommodate these spaces shall not be included as part of the site’s minimum open space;

2. The area necessary to accommodate these spaces shall be included in the impervious coverage for the site and accounted for in the drainage design;

3. Until or unless such spaces are needed, as determined by the Administrator, the areas shall be maintained as open spaces; and

4. The tree approval for the area of additional parking shall be granted separately from the initial approval, and the clearing of trees in that area and subsequent tree replacement shall not occur until or unless such additional parking is required to be constructed.
SEVERABILITY. If any provision, clause, sentence, or paragraph of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this ordinance, which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and any such provisions are declared to be severable. All ordinances or parts thereof inconsistent with this ordinance are repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon adoption at second reading.

BE IT ORDERED AND ORDAINED by the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Atlantic Beach, South Carolina, in assembly and by the authority thereof, this _______ day of _____________, 2023.

Atlantic Beach Town Council

____________________________________
Mayor, Jake Evans

____________________________________
Councilmember, Edward Campbell

____________________________________
Councilmember, Jacqueline Gore

____________________________________
Councilmember, Josephine Isom

Attest:

____________________________________
Town Clerk

____________________________________
Town Manager
ISSUE
Should the eligibility for designation requirements in the Land Management Ordinance be modified for the Planned Development and Flexible Design Districts?

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends approval.

BACKGROUND
Both the Planned Development and Flexible Design Zoning Districts are intended to promote mixed use development within the Town limits. Both districts require that all properties be under the same ownership or corporate ownership prior to a rezoning request being submitted.

ANALYSIS
In many communities, if all of the properties are not under the same ownership at the time of rezoning submission, the rezoning process simply requires that the owner or authorized agent for each property sign the rezoning application. This is because the sale of a property is often contingent upon the approval of a rezoning request. This reduces the risk to a speculative buyer from investing in a property that may not be able to be developed as planned.

The PDD and FDD districts are the only districts in the Town that have an ownership requirement at the time of rezoning application submission.
WHEREAS, The Town of Atlantic Beach is empowered to amend its ordinances from time to time, and to update its Land Management Ordinance to be consistent with state law, the Comprehensive Plan, and the changing needs of the Town, in its best interests, after review by the Town Planning Commission, public notice, and public hearing; and

WHEREAS, South Carolina Code § 6-29-310 empowers an appointed municipal planning commission to hear and make recommendations on Land Management Ordinance changes; and,

WHEREAS, The Land Management Ordinance currently limits the ability for prospective Planned Development and Flexible Design District projects to be considered by the Town, as all properties are required to have the same ownership or cooperate ownership at the time a rezoning application is filed with the Town; and,

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission recommends that the Land Management Ordinance be revised to alleviate the eligibility for designation ownership requirements for Planned Development and Flexible Design Districts.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it enacted and ordained by the Town Council of the Town of Atlantic Beach by the power and authority granted by the State of South Carolina that the Town of Atlantic Beach Zoning Ordinance is hereby amended as follows:

1) Amendment to Article IV. Zoning Districts, Division 4. Planned Development Districts, Section 5.3.441 of the Land Management Ordinance. The Land Management Ordinance is hereby amended with all text in strikethrough shall be deleted and all text shown underlined and bolded shall be added.

SECTION 5.3.441 Eligibility for Designation
Any property or contiguous group of properties within the Town that total is one (1) acre or greater in contiguous area and is held in single or corporate ownership at the time of application may be considered for designation as a planned development district. A planned development district must incorporate a design involving a mixture of housing types and densities and compatible commercial uses, or shopping centers, office parks, and mixed-use developments. Single use or single housing type developments shall not be designated as a planned development.

2) Amendment to Article IV. Zoning Districts, Division 4. Planned Development Districts, Section 5.3.449 of the Land Management Ordinance. The Land Management Ordinance is
hereby amended with all text in strikethrough shall be deleted and all text shown underlined and bolded shall be added.

3) Amendment to Article IV. Zoning Districts, Division 5. Flexible Design Districts, Section 5.3.458 of the Land Management Ordinance. The Land Management Ordinance is hereby amended with all text in strikethrough shall be deleted and all text shown underlined and bolded shall be added.

SECTION 5.3.458 Eligibility for Designation

A. Any WF1 zoned property or contiguous group of WF1 zoned properties within the Town that total is 15,000 square feet or greater in contiguous area and, if multiple parcels, is held in single or corporate ownership at the time of application, may be considered for designation as WF1-FDD.

B. Any WF2 zoned property or contiguous group of WF2 zoned properties within the Town that total is 20,000 square feet or greater in contiguous area and, if multiple parcels, is held in single or corporate ownership at the time of application, may be considered for designation as WF2-FDD.

SEVERABILITY. If any provision, clause, sentence, or paragraph of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this ordinance, which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and any such provisions are declared to be severable. All ordinances or parts thereof inconsistent with this ordinance are repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon adoption at second reading.
BE IT ORDERED AND ORDAINED by the Mayor and Town Council of the Town of Atlantic Beach, South Carolina, in assembly and by the authority thereof, this ______ day of ______________, 2023.

Atlantic Beach Town Council

____________________________________
Mayor, Jake Evans

____________________________________
Councilmember, Edward Campbell

____________________________________
Councilmember, Jacqueline Gore

____________________________________
Councilmember, Josephine Isom

Attest:

____________________________________
Town Clerk

____________________________________
Town Manager
ISSUE
Does the proposed Black Pearl of the Atlantic Waterfront 2 (WF2) – Flexible Design District (FDD) Conceptual Plan meet the pre-application requirements of the Land Management Ordinance?

RECOMMENDATION
Option 1: The Planning Commission shall instruct the applicant to proceed with drafting a detailed Flexible Design District plan and zoning text, based on the proposed conceptual plan, or

Option 2: The Planning Commission shall instruct the applicant to resubmit a revised conceptual plan for additional input from the Administrator or Planning Commission.

BACKGROUND
PINS 392-01-01-0167 and 392-01-01-0153 are currently zoned Waterfront 2 (WF2) and a rezoning application is anticipated to be submitted for these two properties to become a WF2-Flexible Design District (FDD). The proposed rezoning request is for a 21 story, oceanfront condo-tel that will include a mixture of commercial uses, 168 hotel rooms, 36 short term rental units, and 24 condo units, all of which are allowable uses within the WF2 District. The project also includes an 11-story parking garage to accommodate the minimum parking requirements of the Land Management Ordinance.

The following provides details on what the underlying Waterfront 2 (WF2) District allows for and a WF2-Flexible Design District (FDD). An excerpt of the Land Management Ordinance is contained within this packet, followed by the pre-application conceptual plan submitted by the applicant.

Waterfront 2 (WF2) Zoning District. The intent of this district is to provide for pedestrian oriented, beachfront high-density residential and mixed-use development. Mixed-use development is required in conjunction with multi-family development. Uses are intended to be composed of retail, dining, nightclub, and cultural uses while upper levels are generally composed of residential or transient residential uses. This district is intended to provide greater floor area and height than the Waterfront 1 District.

WF2 Allowed Uses: Multi-family, Second and Upper Floor Residential, Hotel/Motel/Inn, Interval Occupancy and Short-Term Rental Residential Units, Government Offices, Parks, some Retail Uses, and most Entertainment, Recreation, and Dining Uses.

Flexible Design District – Purpose and Intent. The intent of the Flexible Design District(s) (FDD) is to provide for higher intensity development along the oceanfront, while providing for a higher level of design and public amenities consistent with the Town of Atlantic Beach
Comprehensive Plan and 2007 Master Plan. This division provides two (2) floating zone district options: The Waterfront 1 Flexible Design District (WF1-FDD) and the Waterfront 2 Flexible Design District (WF2-FDD). Each district is designed to complement the character and the uses allowable within the WF1 or WF2 zoning districts. However, the Flexible Design Districts provide for greater height, floor area ratio, density, and building coverage than fixed zoning districts described in Section 5.3.400, through the use of incentivized flexible development standards.

Summary of District Dimensional Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WF2 (Existing)</th>
<th>WF2-FDD (Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area (sq ft)</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width (in ft)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Structure Height</td>
<td>125 ft and no more than 12 stories</td>
<td>Up to 200 ft and no more than 20 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Building Coverage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Up to 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Impervious Surface</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Up to 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min Open Space</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Up to 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>1 dwelling/1,500 sq ft</td>
<td>1 dwelling/375 sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Flexible Design District can be written to allow a project to veer from some provisions of the Land Management Ordinance, such as defining project specific setbacks or parking requirements. It cannot add uses beyond what is allowed by the underlying WF2 District, nor can it supersede the requirements to obtain the incentives.

ANALYSIS

To be designated as a Flexible Design District, the properties must go through a pre-application conceptual plan review to ensure the project meets the requirements of a flexible design district and that the project aligns with the intent of the comprehensive plan. The Planning Commission review of the conceptual plan will also evaluate the public amenity features proposed as part of the project.

There is no public hearing during the pre-application review process, as a formal rezoning has not been submitted yet. Only after a complete rezoning request has been filed with the Town will a formal public hearing be held, as required by the Land Management Ordinance. The review of this project at this time is technical in nature and to ensure the public benefit items align with the needs of the Town.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements (if 3% or greater public amenity features)</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Meets Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses</strong></td>
<td>Multi-family, Second and Upper Floor Residential, Hotel/Motel/Inn, Interval Occupancy and Short-Term Rental Residential Units, Government Offices, Parks, some Retail Uses, and most Entertainment, Recreation, and Dining.</td>
<td>Condo-tel, including 24 condos, 36 short-term rentals, 168 hotel rooms, retail space, dining, meeting and conference room space, and museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Size</strong></td>
<td>20,000 sq ft</td>
<td>52,899 sq ft or 1.20 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Structure Height</strong></td>
<td>200 feet and no more than 20 stories</td>
<td>Oceanfront Tower – 21 stories and 203 ft Parking Garage – 11 stories, in order to meet minimum parking requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Building Coverage</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>32,007 sq ft or 60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>44,431 sq ft or 84% Developer proposes permeable pavers to ensure the project does not exceed 80% impervious surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Open Space</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16,843 sq ft or 31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</strong></td>
<td>4.0 (4 x 52,899 sq ft = 211,596 sq ft)</td>
<td>11,818 sq ft (19 floors) = 224,542 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density, lot area per dwelling unit</strong></td>
<td>375 sq feet per dwelling unit or up to 141 dwelling units</td>
<td>24 condos and 36 short-term rentals = 50 dwelling units. Hotel units do not count as dwelling units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Amenities</strong></td>
<td>Examples from the Land Management Ordinance include beach accesses, parks, sidewalks, streetscape features, public parking, restrooms, and shower facilities associated with recreational uses.</td>
<td>(1) Community spaces and conference rooms; (2) Black Pearl Museum; (3) Restaurant and Café; (4) Spa and Sauna; (5) Parking Garage; and (6) 27 public parking spaces/beach access parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Amenity Value</strong></td>
<td>3% of $80 million in development costs</td>
<td>Proposes $2.4 million or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Height and Number of Floors:** The Oceanfront Tower cannot exceed 200 ft or 20 stories to be compliant with the FDD district. As currently designed, the Oceanfront Tower is at least 203 ft tall and 21 stories.

2) **Floor Area Ratio:** Floor Area Ratio is a calculation of the total sq footage of the lots x 4.0. 211,596 sq ft is allowed. The FAR = 224,542 sq ft, Floor area calculations do not include parking, mechanical, stairwell, common corridor areas, or publicly accessible entertainment uses.

1) **Impervious Surface:** The project is currently designed with approximately 84 percent of the entire project being impervious. The applicant proposes to use pervious pavers or another pervious material to ensure the project does not exceed the 80 percent impervious limit of the WF2-FDD Zoning.

2) **Setbacks:** The project does not meet the setbacks for the underlying WF2 Zoning District. The applicant is proposing to define their own setbacks in the text of the ordinance.

3) **Public Amenities.** In order for the project to qualify for the 200 ft height maximum with no more than 20 stories, public amenity features totaling 3% (~$2.4 million) or more of the total development costs must be identified and incorporated into the FDD rezoning request. The Land Management Ordinance provides examples of public amenity features, including, but not limited to beach accesses, parks, sidewalks, streetscape features, publicly available parking, restrooms, and shower facilities associated with recreational uses. The pre-application submission further details the public amenity features the project aims to provide the Town. The Planning Commission will need to evaluate if these meet the requirements and are acceptable.

Per the Land Management Ordinance, a **traffic impact study** will be required and the Administrator may require traffic mitigation measures as a condition of permit approval. Similarly, a **beach and pedestrian access management plan** and access improvements may be required as a condition of permit approval. These items are not required at the time of pre-application submission.
DISCLAIMER: This map is a graphic representation of data obtained from various sources. WRCOG assumes no responsibility for the accuracy of the information presented and reserves the right to change the map at any time. Use of this map is at the user's own risk and the user agrees to hold WRCOG harmless from any and all liability arising from the use of this map.
DISCLAIMER: This map is a graphic representation of data obtained from various sources. All efforts have been made to warrant the accuracy of this map. However, WRCOG disclaims all responsibility and liability for the use of this map.
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check, or other instrument readily convertible to cash) to guarantee the installation and/or dedication of required improvements.

SECTION 5.3.452 Recording

All plats and plans approved under the terms of this division shall be recorded in the Office of the Horry County Register of Deeds.

SECTIONS 5.3.453 through 5.3.455 Reserved

DIVISION 5. Flexible Design Districts (Floating Zones)

SECTION 5.3.456 Purpose and Intent

The intent of the Flexible Design District(s) (FDD) is to provide for higher intensity development along the oceanfront, while providing for a higher level of design and public amenities consistent with the Town of Atlantic Beach Comprehensive Plan and 2007 Master Plan. This division provides two (2) floating zone district options: The Waterfront 1 Flexible Design District (WF1-FDD) and the Waterfront 2 Flexible Design District (WF2-FDD). Each district is designed to complement the character and the uses allowable within the WF1 or WF2 zoning districts. However, the Flexible Design Districts provide for greater height, floor area ratio, density, and building coverage than fixed zoning districts described in Section 5.3.400, through the use of incentivized flexible development standards.

SECTION 5.3.457 Creation of Flexible Design Districts (Floating Zones)

A. In addition to the districts provided by Section 5.3.400 et seq. and Division 4, the following districts are hereby created:

   Waterfront 1 Flexible Design District (WF1-FDD)
   Waterfront 2 Flexible Design District (WF2-FDD)

B. The individual districts may be cited by full title, e.g. Waterfront 1 Flexible Design District or by abbreviated reference, e.g. WF1-FDD. Collectively, these districts and affected properties may be referred to as “the FDD”, “floating zoning districts” or “FDD properties.” The requirements for properties in the FDD are based on the floating zone district standards approved by an ordinance of the Town Council. Properties rezoned to a floating zone district will be designated, by legislative act by the Council, with a unique name or identifier as a prefix to the zone’s title, for example: “Atlantic Avenue Oceanfront Plaza WF2-FDD.”

SECTION 5.3.458 Eligibility for Designation

A. Any WF1 zoned property within the Town that is 15,000 square feet or greater in contiguous area and, if multiple parcels, is held in single or corporate ownership at the time of application, may be considered for designation as WF1-FDD.

B. Any WF2 zoned property within the Town that is 20,000 square feet or greater in contiguous area and, if multiple parcels, is held in single or corporate ownership at the time of application, may be considered for designation as WF2-FDD.
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SECTION 5.3.459 Designation to Constitute a Text and Map Amendment

The designation of a property as a Flexible Design District (WF1-FDD or WF2-FDD) shall constitute a zoning text and map amendment. The rezoning of a property(s) to an FDD may only be initiated by the owner of said property. Following approval by the Town Council, the requirements of the respective WF1 or WF2 zoning district are thereafter supplanted by those of the FDD. Except as provided by this division, the rezoning of property to an FDD shall follow the zoning text and map amendment procedures specified in Article III of this Chapter.

SECTION 5.3.460 Effect on Other Ordinances and Rules of General Applicability

FDDs are subject to all other ordinances applicable to development within the Town. Unless expressly stated in this division or provided within the zoning text establishing the floating zone, all lands within an FDD are subject to this Chapter’s requirements of general applicability affecting uses, lots, structures, parking, and other features.

SECTION 5.3.461 Use, Bulk, Dimensional, and Density Standards of the FDD

A. Use Standards. In order to maintain a consistent character within the Town’s waterfront districts, the uses allowed within the WF1 and WF2 districts, as provided in Table 5.3.502, apply to WF1-FDD and WF2-FDD, respectfully. The ordinance creating a WF1-FDD or WF2-FDD may prohibit, restrict, or require a greater level of approval review than provided in WF1 or WF2, as applicable, but may not allow prohibited uses or a lesser level of approval review than as provided in Table 5.3.502.

B. Bulk, Dimensional, and Density Standards. Similarly, except as provided in Table 5.3.461A, the bulk, dimensional, and density standards of the WF1 or WF2 districts, as provided in Table 5.3.420A, shall apply to WF1-FDD and WF2-FDD, respectfully. The ordinance creating a WF1-FDD or WF2-FDD may provide different height, coverage, open space, density, and FAR standards of the WF1 and WF2 districts, only as provided in Table 5.3.461A.
## Table 5.3.461A

### District Bulk, Dimensional & Density Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS</th>
<th>MAXIMUM STRUCTURE HEIGHT</th>
<th>MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE</th>
<th>MINIMUM OPEN SPACE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO</th>
<th>DENSITY (MINIMUM LOT AREA IN SQUARE FEET PER DWELLING UNIT)</th>
<th>MULTI-FAMILY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent of Public Amenity Features and District Standards*</td>
<td>Less than 1%</td>
<td>1% but less than 2%</td>
<td>2% but less than 3%</td>
<td>3% or greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF1-FDD</td>
<td>55 feet and no more than 5 stories</td>
<td>65 feet and no more than 5 stories</td>
<td>75 feet and no more than 5 stories</td>
<td>85 feet and no more than 8 stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF2-FDD</td>
<td>125 feet and no more than 12 stories</td>
<td>145 feet and no more than 14 stories</td>
<td>165 feet and no more than 16 stories</td>
<td>200 feet and no more than 20 stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF1-FDD</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF2-FDD</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF1-FDD</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF2-FDD</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF1-FDD</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF2-FDD</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF1-FDD</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF2-FDD</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF1-FDD</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF2-FDD</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF1-FDD</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF2-FDD</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This table provides the maximum allowable height, coverage, FAR, and density for the WF1-FDD and WF2-FDD based on the provision of public amenity features as a percentage of total development costs. The ordinance creating each floating zone may provide standards more restrictive than those provided above.

### SECTION 5.3.462  FDD Floating Zone Approval Process

In addition to the exhibits required by Article III for zoning map and text amendments, the following are required prior to the review and approval of an FDD:

A. **Pre-Application Conceptual Plan.** Prior to a formal application being filed to rezone a property(s) to a flexible design district, under subsection B, below, a conceptual plan shall be submitted to the Administrator. The conceptual plan shall illustrate the boundaries of the proposed areas to be rezoned to an FDD, the proposed land uses, proposed bulk, dimensional, and height limitations, proposed public amenity features, a proposed lot layout and street configuration, estimated gross...
densities, estimated useable open space, and estimated total development costs and costs of public
amenity features.

The Administrator shall submit the proposed conceptual plan to the Planning Commission with a
recommendation as to whether the proposed design concept is consistent with the Comprehensive
Plan and FDD standards. Within thirty (30) days of its review, the Planning Commission shall
either instruct the applicant to proceed with drafting a detailed FDD design plan and zoning text,
based on the proposed conceptual plan, or to resubmit a revised conceptual plan for additional input
from the Administrator or Planning Commission.

B. Floating Zone District Application. In addition to the requirements of Section 5.3.381, an
applicant for a rezoning under this division shall include the following in an application for
re zoning to FDD:

1. Total development costs, with a categorization of costs, including construction, land,
demolition, utility relocation, and the percent required to develop public amenity facilities;
2. Public amenity features, including a description of their nature; location; public accessibility,
including any limitations on public access; design standards and features; costs to construct;
schedule for construction; and proposed manner of ongoing maintenance, ownership, and
control, including proposed legal instruments and other guarantees to ensure installation,
maintenance, and perpetual public use.
3. A listing of uses within the proposed district, specifying the total acreage for each use, based
on proposed FDD district standards;
4. Illustrative east, west, north, south elevations of the district boundaries; and
5. FDD district standards, as provided in subsection C, below.

C. Floating Zone District Standards. In addition to the requirements of Section 5.3.381, an applicant
for a rezoning under this division shall prepare and submit FDD district standards proposed for any
lands redesignated as an FDD floating zone to the Administrator. The district standards shall
contain all relevant standards proposed by the applicant or recommended by the Planning
Commission and the Administrator. District standards shall include the following:

1. FDD Zoning Text. Proposed text that establishes the requirements of the flexible design
district shall be submitted. At a minimum, the proposed FDD zoning text shall include:
   a. The name of the flexible design district, not duplicating the name of any other FDD or
      subdivision;
   b. A statement of the intent and objectives of the proposed district;
   c. A legal description of the district boundaries, including the location and acreage of varying
densities, uses, or other areas subject to special requirements;
   d. A table of the following proposed land uses & standards:
      (1) Uses permitted within the proposed FDD, in accordance with Section 5.3.461(A), and
          the level of approval review required;
      (2) Maximum and average residential densities for each residential use,
      (3) Maximum proposed floor area ratios and building/lot coverages for each non-
          residential use,
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(4) Maximum allowable height for each use or for the district as a whole,
(5) The minimum setbacks for each use or for the district as a whole,
(6) The minimum separation distance, if any, required between buildings or uses; and
(7) Public amenity facilities and provisions related to their use, maintenance, and the legal mechanism for guaranteeing perpetual use and maintenance, including easements, dedication agreements, or other surety proposed by the applicant.
(8) Any special requirements imposed on development within the district such as landscaping, lighting, architectural, and/or orientation standards.

f. A provision which precludes the application of variances from the flexible design district’s requirements and incorporates, by reference, Section 5.3.464; and

g. A provision which enumerates any requirements of this Chapter that are not applicable to or that are amended upon approval of the flexible design district.

2. FDD Design Plan. An FDD design plan shall be submitted that illustrates:
   a. The surveyed boundary of the district, interior property lines, if multiple parcels, including approximate interior property lines when future division is proposed and permitted;
   b. The location of existing and proposed utilities, streets, easements, and other rights-of-way;
   c. The location and proposed use of existing and planned buildings;
   e. The location of parking lots, drives, and walkways;
   f. The location and acreage of open spaces;
   g. Topographical data including existing and proposed contour elevations, areas of special flood hazard, drainage easements, and storm water detention easements; and
   h. The location, acreage, use of public amenity features.

SECTION 5.3.463 Planning Commission Recommendation

A. In addition to the review criteria for map and text amendments contained in Section 5.3.384, the Planning Commission shall consider the nature, need, and conformance of proposed FDD public amenity features to the comprehensive plan. Public amenity features proposed in an FDD floating zone, with total development costs exceeding $10,000,000, may be considered by the Planning Commission and Town Council in determining eligibility for floating zone designation. Public amenity facilities eligible for the flexible district standards described in Section 5.3.461, include, but are not limited to:

1. Unimproved and improved beach access, a minimum of ten (10) feet in width,
2. Parks and common open spaces of no less than 500 square feet,
3. Ocean viewing or observation decks (indoor or outdoor),
4. The construction of public streets and other rights-of-way, consistent with Town and state transportation plans and standards;

5. Sidewalks and other in-right-of-way pedestrian or bicycle improvements, consistent with Town and state transportation plans and standards;

6. Right-of-way or improvements located in adjacent right-of-way, such as benches, planters, shelters, drinking fountains, bike racks, decorative lighting, commemorative signage, and improvements that enhance handicapped accessibility; and

7. Publicly-available parking; restrooms; and shower facilities associated with recreational uses.

B. In addition to the standards in Article III, Division 8, the Planning Commission in its recommendation and the Town Council in its final action on a proposed FDD floating zone are not obligated to accept or deem eligible any proposed public amenity facility deemed not in compliance with this division, the other applicable provisions of the LMO, or the Comprehensive Plan.

C. The flexible district standards in Table 5.3.461A apply based solely on the percentage costs of proposed public amenity facilities, included in the proposed FDD district standards, in relation to total development costs, as provided in this division and Table 5.3.461A.

D. Following a recommendation by the Planning Commission, the Town Council shall make a final determination whether to approve or deny a request for an FDD floating zoning.

SECTION 5.3.464 Minor Design Plan Modifications and FDD Amendments

A. No minor design plan modification or FDD amendment shall be approved that exceeds the standards of this division or the Comprehensive Plan. Unless provided otherwise in an FDD floating zone approved by the Town Council pursuant to Section 5.3.463, minor design plan modifications and FDD amendments shall comply with this section.

B. Minor Design Plan Modifications. Minor modifications in an approved FDD design plan may be approved by the Administrator provided that such changes do not constitute an FDD amendment, as defined in subsection C, below and do not conflict with approved FDD district standards. Minor modifications may include, but are not limited to: the minor shifting of buildings, proposed streets, public or private ways, utility easements, parks or other public open spaces, or other features of the design plan.

C. FDD Amendments. Major changes in an approved FDD floating zone shall be considered an amendment to the ordinance adopting the FDD standards and shall require a public hearing, review and recommendation by the Planning Commission, and approval by Town Council, as required by this division and Article III. Such major changes include:

1. Increases in density in excess of the approved FDD district standards;
2. Changes in the exterior boundaries of the flexible design district;
3. Alterations to the height of structures in excess of the approved FDD district standards;
4. Increases in the intensity of nonresidential land uses in excess of the approved FDD district standards;
5. Increases in the number of lots (where subdivision has been approved);
6. Material changes in the amount, nature, or extent of public amenity facilities in the approved FDD district standards; or
7. Any proposed revision to the FDD zoning text.
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SECTION 5.3.465 Conformance with Development Regulations and Surety Requirements

When approved FDD district standards provide for the dedication of land or improvements for rights-of-way, parks, or other public spaces and amenities; the division of property into two (2) or more lots; or the installation of other public improvement dedications or public amenity facilities, zoning permits for property within the flexible design district shall not be issued until a final plat, easements, or other surety has been approved in accordance with the standards of this Chapter and Town policies and procedures. Where the final plat is to be recorded prior to the installation of public improvement dedications or public amenity facilities, the Planning Commission shall require the posting of a surety instrument (bond, certified check, or other instrument readily convertible to cash) to guarantee the installation and/or dedication of public improvement dedications and public amenities facilities approved as part of the FDD district standards.

SECTION 5.3.466 Recording

All plats and plans approved under the terms of this section shall be recorded in the Office of the Horry County Register of Deeds.

SECTIONS 5.3.467 through 5.3.499 Reserved
ISOPARM DESIGN GROUP

PARKING LOAD CALCULATIONS

(24 UNITS) 48 PARKING SPACES
TOP TWO LEVELS (2)

PIN NUMBER 392-01-01-0167 & 392-01-01-0153
REQUIRED
STRUCTURE CONDOS

VERTICAL DATUM NAVD88
LOWER THREE LEVELS (3)
HORIZONTAL REQUIRED
SHORT TERM/ AIRBNB TYPE
DATUM NAD83

95 SARATOGA AVENUE, UNIT 3
(168 UNITS) 168 PARKING SPACES
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11233
REQUIRED

"X" FEMA MAP 45051C0612 K
LEVELS HOTEL STYLE UNITS

TWO LOWER LEVELS OF WATER FRONT TOWER 91 SPACES REQUIRED

THOUGH DIRECT PARKING ON SMALL RETAIL SPACES ATLANTIC AVENUE 16 SPACES

NOTES:
92% (0.65 AC OF 0.70 AC) OCEAN FRONT TOWER
74% (0.37 AC OF 0.50 AC) SECOND TOWER
DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, AGENTS, EMPLOYEES AND SUB-CONSULTANTS, TO THE FULLEST EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW, DO HEREBY AGREE TO INDEMNIFY AND HOLD HARMLESS THE ISOPARM DESIGN GROUP, ITS OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, AGENTS, EMPLOYEES AND SUB-CONSULTANTS AND THE OWNER OF THE PREMISES, FROM AND AGAINST ALL DAMAGE, LIABILITY OR COSTS (INCLUDING REASONABLE ATTORNEY'S FEES) ARISING OUT OF OR AS A RESULT OF THE WORK CONDUCTED UNDER THE CONTRACT BY THE CONTRACTOR OR ANY SUB CONTRACTORS/OR ANY THIRD PARTY THAT IS NOT PARTY TO THE CONTRACT FOR BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CONSTRUCTION MEANS, METHODS, DEVIATIONS, TECHNIQUES, SEQUENCES OR PROCEDURES OR SAFETY PRECAUTIONS AND PROGRAMS IN CONNECTION WITH THE WORK FOR THE ACTS OR OMISSIONS OF THE CONTRACTOR, SUBCONTRACTORS OR ANY OF THE WORK OR FOR THE FAILURE OF ANY OF THEM TO CARRY OUT THE WORK IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS. ALWAYS USE DIMENSIONS AS SHOWN, WITH THE WORK FOR THE ACTS OR OMISSIONS OF THE CONTRACTOR, SUBCONTRACTORS OR ANY OF THE WORK OR FOR THE FAILURE OF ANY OF THEM TO CARRY OUT THE WORK IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS.
Development Project Description:

Morant Properties LLC. is proposing to develop a 21 story (20 habitable floors) story high-rise “Condo-Tel” on oceanfront lots 9-11 in the Pearl Beach section and lots 22-24 in the Atlantic Beach section of Horry County, SC. The newly constructed building is currently designed to have 24 luxury condominiums, 36 short term rental units and 168 hotel rooms. Each floor will have, five 1 bedrooms, four 2 bedrooms, one 3 bedroom and two 4 bedrooms, for a total of 12 units per floor. The Black Pearl Project is estimated at approximately $80M to construct. In addition to the room accommodations, the facility will have state-of-the-art amenities such as: meeting and conference rooms; a banquet hall for public and resident community events and functions; fully equipped gym/workout rooms; indoor and outdoor pools; a gift shop; dedicated space for the Town’s Museum to house historic artifacts and memorabilia. The building will have 24-hour security and camera surveillance capabilities.

Parking for patrons and guests will be provided in a 11-story parking deck that will be constructed on the corner lots located on 30th Ave S and Ocean Blvd. As currently designed, the parking garage will accommodate approximately 420 cars with the entrance off 30th Ave.

Economic and Social Benefits to the Town:

The economic and social benefits to the Town of Atlantic Beach are vast. Currently, the Town does not have a major facility to accommodate the many tourists and guests that are looking to visit the culturally and historically rich community. Having a major hotel/condominium venue to host visitors and patrons to the town will greatly enhance marketability and spur additional commercial and residential development in the community.
The development of the Black Pearl Project will have a positive valuation impact on the land and home values for Atlantic Beach.

The Black Pearl Project will create substantial tax revenue while also creating generous business licensing fees for the Town of Atlantic Beach.

Hospitality and Accommodations Tax fees payable to the town are projected to be $______________.

The additional revenue generated by this development project will greatly enhance the Town’s ability to increase police services, make improvements to the town’s infrastructure and add new community amenities. Specifically, to this objective, the Black Pearl Project at the end of construction, will clearly delineate; improve and enhance one beach access point and share in maintaining it in the future. The newly constructed facility will also provide conference space for the resident’s social functions.

Community give back of 3% + Community Benefits:

Our development is just a stone’s throw from the heart of the community; offering world class amenities with second to none modernized facilities. The intention of the Black Pearl is to be the new sought after location for both, local and national organizations.

Both, macro and micro benefits to the community from this proposed development far exceed the 3% allocation requirement. The Town of Atlantic Beach will directly benefit from the hundreds of temporary and permanent employment opportunities created from this development. The Black Pearl will be the conduit through which an opportunity to educate and connect the past with the present will occur.

The first floor is meticulously sectioned into four quadrants, each of which serving a specific purpose, benefiting the town:

Quadrant 1 will house community spaces and conference rooms. The spaces will allow for large and small gatherings, providing a safe space for the town to meet.

Quadrant 2 will be solely dedicated to the Black Pearl Museum. The development team wants to create a modern facility to educate and connect current generations with the uniquely rich history of the Town of Atlantic Beach and the Gullah Geechee culture.

Quadrant 3 is dedicated to a world-class restaurant and café. This space will allow for views out to the ocean with sweeping terraces, and will double as a small wedding venue to capture some of the estimated 5,000 weddings that occur each year, elsewhere along the Myrtle Beach strip.

Quadrant 4 is dedicated to a luxury spa and sauna offering, 5-star pampering for the guests and community. Relaxation and rejuvenation will be central to the design.

Parking Garage - This development will allow for additional off-street parking which is so desperately needed in the area. Our parking structure will be designed for the future growth of Atlantic Beach. The structural design of the garage will allow for additional parking levels to be added during a later phase

Site Improvements – As currently designed the development team envisions adding ~27 community parking spaces (not included in the parking calculations) in the 50 foot public right of way. This easy beach front parking access is a direct benefit to the community.

~$2.4 million equates to 3% of our estimated hard construction costs, but our development team anticipates spending upwards of $6,400,000. The development team has earmarked $2.5 million for site improvements to help foster access, egress and ingress to and around our site. That being said, the total minimum benefit back to the town we anticipate to
be close to $9,000,000, allowing the beachfront to be accessible and enjoyable to all, which has always been a goal of the development team. This coupled with the ground floor equals approximately 32,000 ft.² of usable community space, which will directly benefit the town.

The development team has vowed to spend a min. of 3% of the construction costs on public amenities as clearly defined in the land management ordinance. The additional amenities or spaces we deem to benefit the public such as the museum, government or police offices will not count against the 3% requirement. Also, the community give back will be structured in tiers. Should the project be reduced in scope, we will allocate a minimum of 3% of said amount or total development costs.

Overall, in addition to providing a first-class resort facility, our objective is to contribute to the continued revitalization and preservation of the rich cultural heritage of Atlantic Beach. We feel that our development project will greatly enhance the positive image of the town and make Atlantic Beach a preferred “Destination” for those looking to vacation and partake in its rich Afro-Centric cultural heritage.
NEW MIXED USE CONDO-TEL DEVELOPMENT

THE BLACK PEARL OF THE ATLANTIC

MORANT PROPERTIES

GROUNDFLOOR

03/01/2020 12:44:08 PM

Page 86 of 92
UNIT CALCULATIONS:
1 bedroom - 1 unit per floor - 95 total
2 bedroom - 4 units per floor - 76 total
3 bedroom - 1 unit per floor - 10 total
4 bedroom - 2 units per floor - 38 total
Total # of units: 228
ELEVATIONS AND RENDERINGS SHOWN FOR ILLUSTRATION PURPOSES ONLY. FINAL DESIGN TO BE SUBMITTED AND RESOLVED FOR FULL APPLICATION