



PLANNING & INSPECTION DEPARTMENT

Post Office Box 10, Atlantic Beach, NC 28512

(252) 726-4456
Fax (252) 726-7043

Michelle Shreve Eitner
planner2@atlanticbeach-nc.com

Memorandum

To: Council / Planning Board
From: Michelle Eitner, Planning and Development Director
Date: November 18, 2020
Re: Technical Review Committee Meeting Review Summary

The Technical Review Committee met in the Atlantic Beach Boardroom at 10am on Tuesday, November 17, 2020. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss three major site plan concept proposals. Committee members in attendance included: Mayor Pro Tem Rich Johnson (as delegate for Council), Planning Boardmember Sharron Wilson (as delegate for P. B.), Town Manager David Walker, Public Services Director Marc Schulze, Police Chief Jeff Harvey, Deputy Fire Chief Casey Arthur, and myself, Planning and Development Director Michelle Eitner. Ron Cullipher P.E., authorized agent for all three major site plan submissions, attended and sat at the table with the Committee to answer questions. In the audience were Councilman Austin Waters (an adjacent property owner to the Oceanana Redevelopment property), Planner Julian Griffey, and Billy Sparkman, developer for the Crystal View Amendment major site plan. DCM (CAMA) Field Rep Heather Styron was invited but was unable to attend, so she sent her comments via email in advance of the meeting. Those comments have been copy & pasted into this memo.

Prior to the beginning of the meeting, Waters pointed out an error in surveying on the Oceanana Redevelopment site plan adjacent to his property on Tryon Street. Cullipher noted that the survey work for the site plan was done by a surveyor from another company, so he would contact the surveyor to discuss the needed change. Johnson pointed out that the western adjacent properties in the Oceanana Redevelopment site plan showed "MHI" and that this needs to be corrected to "MUN" to reflect the true zoning district of those properties. Cullipher wrote down a note to make that correction.

The meeting began by discussing what is required of a Technical Review Committee meeting and report. Section 18.2.4.P.6 specifies site plan review standards, which are:

- a. All standards or conditions of any prior applicable permits and development approvals; and
- b. All applicable requirements of this Ordinance, the Town Code of Ordinances, and State and federal laws.

I presented each major site plan, including application materials, compliance matrix (chart with corresponding requirements and notes), and public interest items. The items are presented order of file number, which corresponds with its complexity. Below is a summary of discussion on each item:

- **MSP-20-1 Crystal View Amendment** – “*An amendment to the Crystal View Condominiums major site plan, to change the active open space from shared access of the existing swimming pool to a horseshoe court directly south of the proposed building.*”
 - No comments were offered following discussion of UDO compliance.
 - Heather Styron’s email stated, “[No comment on the Crystal View Condos because they are not within the CAMA AEC.](#)”
- **MSP-20-2 Tackle Box Amendment** – “*An amendment to the Grove Oceanside II Phase II (AKA Tackle Box Tavern) major site plan, to recombine the two commercial parcels to allow the Tackle Box to expand to include a restaurant named “Bait Box”.*”
 - During presentation of the compliance matrix, I noted that the expansion of the floor area will require an additional parking space attributed to this use. Cullipher stated that there is an additional space at the Circle WWTP parking lot that will be utilized to meet this requirement.
 - DC Arthur noted that the fire code occupancy of the building would be addressed at Phase Two, which is when more detailed floor plans and building plans would be presented for review.
 - Heather Styron’s email stated, “[As far as the Tacklebox, If they still have a valid major and they are adding impervious etc., they are going to have to modify their major permit as well as may have to modify any storm water or DWR permits etc.](#)”
 - Cullipher stated that the stormwater permit was created to allow for more impervious than they’re proposing now, so it wouldn’t need to be modified. He also said that the CAMA Major has likely expired (as they’re valid for 5 years), so this would not fall under the Major permit. I pointed out that if it’s not reviewed as part of the whole development under the Major permit,

then it would be subject to a Minor permit instead, and the building is not within the AEC so it wouldn't need a Minor permit.

- **MSP-20-3 Oceanana Redevelopment** – “*A major site plan for redevelopment of the Oceanana Motel, Pier House, and manufactured home park, to include 17 townhouses, 127 condominium units, pier house, and swimming pool.*”
 - Comments were interspersed throughout the presentation as applicable items came up.
 - Discussion was held as to whether the new sewer plant would have offensive odors, as it is very close to residential properties. The property owner directly to the west of the proposed sewer plant, George Richardson, had contacted staff via telephone to see if odor would be an issue, and the property owner to the south, Councilman Waters noted he shared that concern as well. Cullipher stated that the system had not been designed yet, but that the plants around town are much older (newest one being 15 years old at the Circle) and technology has improved so he doesn't think it will be an issue. I will keep this inquiry in mind at the second phase of review to bring it back up once the design of the plant has been completed and approved by the state.
 - DC Arthur discussed the fire code requirements for the buildings. The 17-unit townhouse building would not be required to have sprinklers, since they're built under the Residential Building Code, but the remainder of the buildings would be subject to the requirements of the fire code. Arthur made recommendations of road widths for apparatus access to buildings and to hydrants, of which he said four would likely be required. Johnson asked if the ladder on the fire truck was tall enough to reach the top floor of the 50'-55'-tall condo building. Arthur explained that while they can reach the top, there are fire code requirements in place so that the whole building can be addressed regardless of ladder height. This includes Fire Department Connections (FDC), standpipes, and hydrants, in addition to building codes and several other complex requirements for safety. Arthur stated that further review would be possible once they receive more detailed plans at Phase Two review and with building permits.
 - DC Arthur confirmed that the proposed cul-de-sac ending of the drive aisle will meet requirements as long as it is at least 96' across and the center of it has simple landscaping or otherwise can be driven over in an emergency.
 - The driveway entrances and drive aisles were discussed as well. Chief Harvey noted that though the UDO requires a 70'/10' sight triangle, he recommends additional precaution due to

the curvature of East Fort Macon Road which makes it difficult to pull out into traffic. He also noted that a pedestrian crosswalk would be advisable to allow safer movement to and from Amos Mosquitos across the street.

- The state stormwater permit was discussed. Johnson asked if stormwater retention would be required like for typical residential projects. Cullipher explained that with a stormwater permit redevelopment exclusion, like we've recently seen for the Public Safety & Admin Complex project, the allowed impervious coverage is limited to what is existing on the property, and that the flow of runoff must go the same direction. Cullipher said that the project will have significantly less impervious coverage and therefore less stormwater runoff, but will continue to flow to the NCDOT storm drains within East Fort Macon Road / Highway 58.
- Heather Styron's email stated, "[The Oceanana project will be required to apply for a CAMA major permit. I also want to add that before they do this, they need to contact NCDWR. There is a new federal rule for 401 certification that means the applicant must contact DWR for a preconstruction prior to a major permit application submittal. This can be achieved through a scoping meeting with Cameron Weaver with all of the commenting agencies. I recommend they set up a scoping meeting anyway due to the scope of this project.](#)"
- Cullipher said that he was aware that the scoping meeting would be required and that they would be pursuing that after the Concept Proposal phase.

Once all offered questions were answered and applicable comments were noted, the meeting was adjourned. Staff did not note when the meeting ended.