

## Tina Mazzo

---

**From:** Mike Mansson <mmansson@zpi.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 3:43 PM  
**To:** tmazzo@surfsidebeach.org  
**Cc:** Scott.vonbuseck@gmail.com; Mabrams001@sc.rr.com; Melodye@melodye.com; Michael.pesce@conwaynationalbank.com; Sammy@mooreandassoc.net; Wkinken@gmail.com; browncm3@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Public Comments for Planning Commission Meeting Dated 6/2/2020  
**Importance:** High

Tina - My apologies, but the previous email was sent prior to a few last edits as well as looping in the members of the Planning Commission. Please utilize this email as my formal public comments for the planning commission meeting tonight, June 2, 2020:

I am writing as a representative and member of Storage Partners-Surfside Beach, LLC, the owners of TMS# 1910001117; Portion Tract A (Surfside Beach) and Deerfield HWY Frontage; TB & PT TRA TMS# 1910001116 (Horry County).

I am writing to provide public comments associated with the two discussion items on the agenda for the Planning Commission Regular Meeting dated June 2, 2020. The two discussion items are:

- Parking Standards - SC Overview
- Article V - Nonconformities

I offer the following comments:

- A petition was signed by 110 Surfside Beach residents voicing opposition against reducing the parking requirements associated with self storage. This petition was started yesterday and ran for less than 24 hours while gaining the 110 resident signatures. The residents and property owners have actively voiced their opposition to see future self storage development in the area and easing the parking requirements is being done so to allow a self storage development that has failed to obtain the rezoning approvals for its development along Hwy 17.
- The Planning Commission in 2019 unanimously voted to have self storage developments not allowed to be developed along Hwy 17. The next step was, which the Town Council recommended recently as well, was to hold a Public Workshop to discuss the implication of self storage and where it should or shouldn't be located and to formally amend the zoning accordingly. This has not happened. A workshop hosted by the planning commission is still yet to be held which should be done before considering either of the two discussion items from the meeting on June 2, 2020.
- The parking standards reference an SC Overview, but a cherry picked selection of jurisdictions are all that have been presented. What about Georgetown, Conway, Myrtle Beach, Town of Mount Pleasant, et.? If consideration to what other jurisdictions are doing shouldn't a true comparison be preformed?
- Surfside Beach is currently oversupplied with self storage by nearly 90,000SF at this time (within a 1 mi radius increasing significantly as you go to a 3 a 5 mile radius). Using nationally recognized supply and demand analysis, Surfside's residential population would need to increase by over 11,500 people in order to meet the current supply just within the 1 mile radius of Surfside. This growth is nowhere on the horizon and more storage is not needed.
- If the recommendations of the Article V - Nonconformities were to be adopted, every single building developed prior to the Town Code being adopted would be potentially out of conformance and

thus potentially requiring for business licenses to be discontinued until the property is brought up to the current code. This would put much of Surfside Beach in jeopardy of their buildings being out of conformance and potentially having to close their businesses.

- The individual who recommended these changes should be questioned as she has a direct financial relationship with the self storage development that has failed to be rezoned in Surfside. Her involvement with the developer that is still trying to identify a loophole to have their self storage development approved along Hwy 17 is a direct conflict of interest and is subject to legal scrutiny.

I hope that you will all that the time to truly hear these comments, question the reasoning associated with the discussion and act in accordance to what the best planning practices are for Surfside Beach.

Respectfully,

Michael Mansson  
% Surfside Partners-Surfside Beach, LLC

## Tina Mazzo

---

**From:** john gilchrist <jgil5009@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 30, 2020 12:23 PM  
**To:** tmazzo@surfsidebeach.org  
**Subject:** zoning

I have a concern regarding your proposed agenda items for your Planning commission meeting. It seems you are taking direction from council and/or our temporary planner. This is inappropriate and violates your charter. You seem to be willing to focus on an individual development proposed for our Town. This is clearly NOT the role of our Planning Commission.

Our Planning Commission is our independent board to protect our Town's overall comprehensive plan, our vision and appeal, and ensure compliance with all laws, regulations and ordinances. Your recommended changes need to benefit ALL and our Town in general. Your myopic focus on this single property and development is not fulfilling your service to our Town.

I understand this is no longer a zoning issue. However, it still seems to be another mechanism to get the storage facility approved. The rezoning of this property was defeated for a variety of reasons. There still is the question of conflict of interests and public opposition to this scheme.

We know our temporary COG planner has a previous connection with the property owners. She needs to recuse herself from this process and this project entirely. If not for her, would this have been placed on the agenda? Has she provided a detailed explanation of the reasons for this change as required? How does this have a broad application and benefit to the Town? You have already recommended a significant revision to our zoning ordinance and put it in front of council for approval. Why are you considering this change now?

The residents have previously spoken. Please represent us as you are commissioned to

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)