

**TOWN OF EMERALD ISLE  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2015**

Chairman Jim Craig called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. Members present were, Steve Leroy, Candace Dooley, Ken Sullivan, Ryan Ayre, Pete Wachter and Paul Schwartz. Also present was Jim Jennings Interim Director Planning.

A motion was made by Candice Dooley to approve the minutes of the Planning Board meeting held on January 26, 2014. The motion was seconded by Ryan Ayre and passed unanimously (6 to 0).

For the month of January and February 2015, the Planning and Inspections Department had issued permits with a total value in excess of \$3,842,487. This brings the fiscal year total to over \$10.1 million in construction value for all permits and the department has collected approximately \$71,050.40 in permit fees.

**SUBJECT: Request from Coastal Architecture, on behalf of Transportation Impact, for Commercial Review of the proposed multi-use building to be located on Crew Drive (just east of Islander Drive).**

Transportation proposes to build its 3-story headquarters on Crew Drive. The structure and will have offices on the first floor, offices and a residence on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, and a restaurant plus another residence on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. The sprinklered, 40-foot tall building will contain almost 4,000 square feet per floor. The rooftop area will contain seating for patrons of the restaurant, as well as a separate, private area for the third floor residence. The properties are zoned Village West and the proposed uses are permitted uses.

The applicant has submitted extensive site information, including a color graphic of the north elevation. Attached are 17 Plan sheets:

- Sheet SP-1: Site Plan
- Sheet SP-2: Grading/Dimensioning Plan
- Sheet SP-3: Parking Plan and Details
- Sheet SP-4: Stormwater Plan
- Sheet SP-5: Stormwater Details
- Sheet SP-5B: Stormwater Details
- Sheet SP-6: Waterline and Town Driveway Plan
- Sheet SP-7: Impervious Calculations, Drainage Divide, and SHWT
- Sheet SP-8: Waterline and Driveway Plan
- Sheet SP-9: Existing Conditions
- Sheet SP-10: Erosion Control Plan
- Sheet SP-11: Erosion Control Details
- Sheet A-1: 1<sup>st</sup> Level Floor Plan
- Sheet A-1.1: 2<sup>nd</sup> Level Floor Plan
- Sheet A-1.2: 3<sup>rd</sup> Level Floor Plan
- Sheet A-1.3: Roof Level Floor Plan
- Sheet 3: Elevations

The proposed project complies with the requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Some of the more important or pertinent facts are that 43 parking spaces are required and 49 are being provided; at least 25% of the site must be vegetated and 26% is provided; no more than 35% of any façade may be glazed and the proposed glazing does not exceed 26% for any of the 4 elevations. The UDO requires that the exterior wall faces that are viewable from a street have a visual break every 20 feet and that has been met.

The septic and repair fields will be located in the southwest quadrant of the property. The applicants are proposing to use Carter-Craven EMC lighting to provide illumination for the parking areas and building grounds. Also wall-mounted lights will be located next to each of the entrances. The dumpster will be located at the west end of the parking lot.

The Town's Technical Review Committee (TRC) reviewed the project at its March meeting. Town staff requested several clarifications and minor revisions to the plan and noted several Fire Code issues that will need to be addressed in the building plans before a Building Permit can be approved. The stormwater plan is currently under review.

Staff recommends that the Planning Board recommend to the Board of Commissioners that they approve the proposed headquarters building for Transportation Impact, subject to approval of the stormwater plan. Staff will be glad to answer any questions regarding the foregoing information.

A motion was made by Pete Wachter to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to approve the request from Coastal Architecture, on behalf of Transportation Impact for the multi-use building. The motion was seconded by Ken Sullivan and passed unanimously (6 to 0).

**SUBJECT: Request from Glen Lancaster and Brian Taylor for Commercial Review approval of the proposed re-location of the existing Icehouse at 211 Islander Drive to the NW corner of Reed Drive and Islander Drive.**

At its September 2007 meeting, the Planning Board recommended to the Board of Commissioners that they approve the proposed original location (see attached Staff report). The Commissioners agreed with that recommendation and approved the proposal at their October 2007 meeting.

The potential new owners are requesting approval to relocate to the NW corner of Reed Drive and Islander Drive (about 20 feet from the existing shrimp sales facility at the same corner).

The proposed project complies with the setback requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). There will be one handicapped parking space and one regular parking space (see attached Site Plan). The site is currently paved and there will be no increase in the impervious surfaces.

Staff recommends that the Planning Board recommend to the Board of Commissioners that the Commissioners approve the proposed re-location of the previously-approved Icehouse. Staff will be glad to answer any questions regarding the foregoing information.

A motion was made by Pete Wachter to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to approve of the re-location of the existing Icehouse from 211 Islander Drive to the NW corner of Reed Drive and Islander Dr. The motion was seconded by Ryan Ayre and passed unanimously (6 to 0).

**SUBJECT: Potential Text Amendments to Chapters 2, 5, and 6 of the Unified Development Ordinance regarding signs, elevator heights, natural areas, and engineering reviews**

As noted last month, several issues related to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) have arisen, such as deficiencies and inconsistencies in the Sign Code, the maximum permitted height for elevator shafts, and "natural areas". In addition, the NC General Statutes now require that municipalities with delegated State

authority, such as the CAMA and stormwater programs, must develop ordinances that establish specific review procedures for stamped, Engineer-prepared documents.

**Signs:** The Sign Code allows a 50-square foot freestanding sign on a street frontage and, then, a second 50-square foot freestanding sign if there is a second frontage. However, for wall signs, only 32 square feet is available no matter how many streets a business fronts on. To make this a little more equitable, Staff's revised recommendation for multi-frontage businesses is to allow a maximum of 48 square feet but not more than 32 square feet on any one frontage. This, of course, would not apply to the interior businesses that front on only one street. They would still receive the current 32-square foot maximum for their one frontage.

In addition, Staff is proposing "clean-up" language for the strip lighting regulations, changing the emphasis from neon and fluorescent strip lighting to emphasizing the prohibition on strip lighting, which might, for example, be comprised of LED, neon, or fluorescent lighting, among others.

A motion was made by Ken Sullivan to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to make Text Amendments to Section 6.1.3 and Section 6.6. The Motion was seconded by Candice Dooley and passed unanimously (6 to 0).

**Elevator Shafts:** The UDO is somewhat unclear as to the height limit intended for elevator shafts; it could be 10 feet or 15 feet, depending on one's interpretation of the wording. Rather than continuing to leave it open to interpretation, Staff is suggesting that it be stated as 15 feet, as recommended by the Town Attorney.

A motion was made by Ken Sullivan to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to make Text Amendments to Section 5.1. The motion was seconded by Pete Wachter and passed unanimously (6 to 0).

**Natural areas:** It has been custom that, when determining "natural area" for a Dunes and Vegetation Permit, the water area within the property lines that extend into the Sound are counted as "natural area" but the UDO wording stating this explicitly has been missing. In addition, it would seem fair to allow a homeowner to remove "natural area" from one part of a lot, as long as it is replaced with the same or more elsewhere on-site.

A motion was made by Candice Dooley to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to make Text Amendments to Section 6.4. The motion was seconded by Ryan Ayre and passed unanimously (6 to 0).

**Engineer-prepared documents:** The proposed new text is copied directly from the "Model" language proposed by the NC league of Municipalities. It is not replacing any other text; it is additive.

A motion was made by Paul Schwartz to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to make Text Amendments to Section 2.3. The motion was seconded by Pete Wachter and passed unanimously (6 to 0).

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion was made by Pete Wachter to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Candace Dooley and passed unanimously (6 to 0). The meeting was adjourned at 6:57 PM.

Respectfully submitted by:

Peggy Grammer, Secretary  
Town of Emerald Isle Planning Board