

**TOWN OF ATLANTIC BEACH**

**April 1, 2008**

**Planning Board Minutes**

**APPROVED**

**Members Present**

Larry Burke  
John Hopkins  
Steve Joyner  
Ray Langley, Chairman  
Norman Livengood, Vice-Chair  
Scott Rice, MD

**Staff Present**

Nina Erwin, Secretary  
Jessica Fiester, Planner  
Landin Holland, Consultant

**Others Present**

Doug Brady, Beach Huts, LLC  
Trace Cooper, Mayor

**Members Absent**

John Rivers

**<<<<RECORDER MALFUNCTION (Loose wires under recorder)>>>>**

**Notes were taken by Nina Erwin, Secretary, for at least the first thirty (30) minutes of the meeting.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Ray Langley called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. A motion was made by Chairman Langley to excuse John Rivers from the meeting. Norman Livengood, Vice-Chair, seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS**

**There were no comments from the audience.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Langley requested a motion to approve the Planning Board minutes of March 4, 2008. Norman Livengood, Vice-Chair, made the motion. Dr. Scott Rice seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**PRESENTATION AND REQUEST FOR PLAN APPROVAL BY BEACH HUTS, LLC**

**(Much of the presentation was lost due to recorder malfunction.)**

Permeable pavers – Mr. Brady stated that they work well. Larry Burke asked if sediment would collect where the pavers locked together. Mr. Brady said yes. Mr. Burke said that if the vacuum would remove sediment up to four (4) inches, it would be easier than permeable concrete. Mr. Burke asked how sand would be removed from the concrete. Chairman Langley said that concrete can easily be vacuumed. Steve Joyner said that maintenance is everything. Mr. Brady said that maintenance is an issue with permeable pavers and concrete.

Chairman Langley stated that he cannot speak to whether the pavers will absorb just as much water as the pervious concrete. The problem with the pavers is that they sit on a very loose gravel base. In a

commercial application such as Beach Huts, LLC, during the busy season, there will be 100 plus car trips per day traveling through virtually the same area each time. There will be heavy trash trucks with a heavy static load driving through. With this loose gravel, over a period of time the pavers will move laterally and vertically. Chairman Langley stated that he is more partial to the pervious concrete because this material bonds together and stays together. The load pressure is spread over a larger area instead of concentrating it on small blocks. A residential application would be a different situation.

Mr. Brady said that the pervious pavers are more expensive than the pervious concrete. The pavers are rated for fire trucks and regular traffic. We are more than happy to apply the pervious concrete. Pervious pavers are an upgrade to the pervious concrete.

Chairman Langley stated that when the permeable pavers start to shift, some permeability could possibly be lost. Mr. Brady suggested that particular issue should be included in the maintenance agreement. In other words, if the pervious pavers do not remain level, they would have to be reinstalled.

Mr. Brady said that the developers prefer the pervious pavers to pervious concrete because of their look. There is no differential between the pavers and the concrete, as far as the State is concerned.

Larry Burke said that with the pervious concrete, the color is inconsistent. For example, a driveway was poured in two (2) separate pours, and the driveway was two (2) different colors. The driveway was redone and the concrete was still in two (2) different colors.

Landin Holland, Consultant, said that one of the overriding concerns is maintenance. Maintenance can be resolved prior to final approval. A document can be set in place to make sure that the pavement be maintained for the life of the project on the site. Maintenance should not be the ultimate end to the decision. The larger issue is whether the Board is comfortable with the system and its effectiveness. Through a document review by the Town Attorney, an end can be reached as to how the project can be maintained and inspected. Chairman Langley said that he agreed that the maintenance is not a big issue because it can be accomplished through legal documents. Planner Jessica Fiester stated that the Board can review that document prior to the final approval.

Chairman Langley said to Mr. Brady that as far as the benefit to the neighborhood, this is as good a package presented as could be.

Steve Joyner asked Mr. Brady if he was going to go with the package treatment plant or a septic system. Mr. Brady said that with the new technology, package plants are so much smaller these days for the site, and that other options were being looked into.

Chairman Langley asked the Board members if they were comfortable with the interlocking pervious pavers/pervious concrete, and if the 1:1 credit would be sufficient to allow as it is now proposed. Concerning the double dumpster pad on the northeast corner, John Hopkins asked if it was the only one other than the one by the package plant. Mr. Brady said yes. Mr. Hopkins stated that since it is so close to Pelican Drive, rather than the dumpster truck having to come in on the pervious materials, if the dumpster pad could be closer to Pelican Drive. The truck could get to the dumpsters without driving over the expensive pervious material. That dumpster pad location may change. Staff explained buffering requirements do not allow this.

Chairman Langley asked if there were any other questions or discussions. **There was no response.**

Chairman Langley said that either the Board can approve the footprint as it is now (temporary approval), pending a final review and approval, or the Board can deny it as it stands, or the Board can make it a

temporary approval with contingencies. It is really a matter of yes with temporary approval and the conditions for final or just a simple no. He asked Planner Fiester and Consultant Holland if he was correct in stating it that way. Consultant Holland said that if there was a preliminary approval with the condition of providing the additional items prior to site-plan approval, they will then be working with Staff.

Steve Joyner stated that Jungle Drive would be graded when it was changed so that the water would be less likely to run north. Mr. Brady said yes and now there is water running down that road sheeting off other areas and off of the Jungle property. This plan would reduce the amount of water that is getting there at this time. The developers may come back and place the drains in the middle of the road so that the water in the road is actually draining in the road.

Larry Burke asked if what the developers were asking for is a 1:1 credit. Planner Fiester said no and that the credit would be less than 1:1.

Chairman Langley requested that Planner Fiester read the list of contingencies.

Planner Fiester said a motion must be made to approve the plan as drawn on the new one Mr. Brady handed out, and it should only be considered a preliminary approval and it would include the use of permeable pavers. Prior to permits being issued, a final approval will be necessary.

1. Planning Board has to approve the maintenance agreement drafted by the Town Attorney
2. Possibly homeowner's bylaws
3. Stormwater plan which the Planning & Inspections Department would require prior to issuing a permit on anything over 25%
4. Sewer plan approved by all necessary parties
5. Ground and building elevations

Chairman Langley entertained a motion to give preliminary approval or to deny approval. Dr. Scott Rice made the motion to give preliminary approval as per the new drawing. John Hopkins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Ray Langley entertained a motion to adjourn. The motion was made by Steve Joyner. Norman Livengood, Vice-Chair, seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 6:58 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nina M. Erwin, Secretary

Approved,

Ray Langley, Chairman