

## 2005 Candidate Responses

Candidate	Changes to the current 35ft. height limitation
<b>Jim Lowell</b>	The only way the 35 ft height limit can be changed is by a referendum of the voters of Holden Beach. I can't believe this could ever happen. I have supported the limit and still do.
<b>Norman Meares</b>	All the current building regulations should stay the same. The height of 35ft. limitation was created to protect Holden Beach identity as a Family Beach. It should never be changed.
<b>Jack Smith</b>	The 35 ft. height is what Holden beach is. It is what makes Holden Beach the desirable location it is. To change this established rule would destroy our quality of life as we know and enjoy it today. I pledge to you to never support any change to the 35 ft. height ordinance
<b>Charlie Boyle</b>	The 35 foot height limitation should be kept
<b>Sandy Dillon</b>	I agree with the current 35 foot height limitation.
<b>John Hancock</b>	I would certainly be in favor of maintaining the present 35 foot limit. We do not want to turn into Myrtle Beach with multiple high rise condos bordering our ocean front. It is my understanding that this is controlled by state law anyway.
<b>John Heimlich</b>	Absolutely no change
<b>Alan Holden</b>	I supported this limit at the time it became part of Holden Beach requirements. I still support the same building envelope that was allowed then. My position has never changed.
<b>Sandy Miller</b>	It is imperative that we keep the 35' height limitation. You have my pledge that I will not support any increase.
<b>Pat Sandifer</b>	I am strongly in favor of maintaining the 35' height limitation, as that promotes low density and orderly growth.
<b>Gary Staley</b>	I would NOT favor any increase in the 35' height limit. I consider this limit to be the "Great Protector" of our way of life on the island. Keep in mind that our board of Commissioners could not change this even if they wanted to. The only way it could be changed would be for the state legislature to approval a local referendum to be held, and you the voters would have to vote to change it. I would oppose any such change any way I could.
<b>Grady Watkins</b>	I am for maintaining the 35' height limit.

## 2005 Candidate Responses

Candidate	Changes to the current 30% lot coverage restrictions
<b>Jim Lowell</b>	This is connected to CAMA and it should be kept. Some would say that the percentage should apply to "buildable" lot area rather than "platted" since sometimes what is platted is in a canal or otherwise under water. A change now, however, penalizes those who have bought lots in the past with the expectations of building what they would like only to be refused. And without some form of grandfathering, existing houses on similar lots, if destroyed by storm, would not be allowed to be rebuilt. Fairness would mean leaving it alone.
<b>Norman Meares</b>	This too was created to protect the identity of Holden Beach. You can build a nice house within the 30% coverage limitations. I feel very strongly that this regulation should not be changed.
<b>Jack Smith</b>	We should maintain the existing 30% lot coverage ordinance. 30% coverage is adequate for any reasonable house. We should also maintain the existing set back ordinance. The two complement each other and insure that we will not have the block long houses as you see at some of the other beach communities. To change either of these ordinances would have a negative impact on our quality of life and destroy the Town's small town appearance. I pledge to you to never support any change to the lot coverage and set back ordinances.
<b>Charlie Boyle</b>	The 30% lot coverage should remain
<b>Sandy Dillon</b>	I only support the current zoning ordinance of 30% of property.
<b>John Hancock</b>	I would be in favor of maintaining the present 30% coverage restriction. It has served us well and should in the future. We certainly need the open natural space for storm water to soak into the ground as evidenced by the recent rains. This would also be a limiting factor for how large a home could be built once the sewer is completed.
<b>John Heimlich</b>	Absolutely no change
<b>Alan Holden</b>	I have always supported this with the allowances and regulations that go hand in hand with it.
<b>Sandy Miller</b>	It is also essential that the 30% lot coverage restrictions be maintained. Again, I pledge not to support any increase in lot coverage.
<b>Pat Sandifer</b>	I am in favor of our 30% lot coverage restriction because this is designed as a method of storm water management and keeps our density controlled.
<b>Gary Staley</b>	I would NOT support a change in the 30% lot coverage restriction. Again, this could not be changed by our Board of Commissioners. It is a CAMA regulation that we do not control.
<b>Grady Watkins</b>	I am for maintaining the 30% impervious surface coverage limit now in place.

## 2005 Candidate Responses

Candidate	The need for new occupancy limits to replace the septic tank restrictions that will go away after the sewer system is installed
<b>Jim Lowell</b>	In most cities, occupancy limits are part of the fire code especially for rental units. Until recently, our county did not have a fire marshal but now that we do, this is something that should be pursued with the county which has the jurisdiction. At present, I believe, the only requirement the marshal has made are for hotels, not condo or family rentals.
<b>Norman Meares</b>	I don't support "bedroom" or occupancy limitations. Generations of families like to rent one house on Holden Beach for vacations and a house with multiple bedrooms enables these families to do so. Economically, the sand on our beach is supported by occupancy taxes, and more bedrooms means potentially more rental income and occupancy taxes. This also makes us less dependent upon property taxes for beach renourishment projects. The height restrictions and lot coverage limits and restricts the size of the houses.
<b>Jack Smith</b>	Occupancy limits have been discussed many times with no real results. With septic tank limits on number of bed rooms gone, there will be more bed rooms in some houses. The issue always comes down to "how do you enforce a limit on occupancy." The realtors spell out the sleeping capacity, but we all know that is often ignored. I think a more realistic and enforceable measure is to define the parking capacity and for the Police to enforce the no parking areas firmly. I have seen and heard many complaints of cars parked along OBW, spilled over from rental houses, it is not only dangerous, but illegal.
<b>Charlie Boyle</b>	This is a very hard ordinance to enforce as it is difficult to check on how many people are occupying a home. Even saying that, I am in favor of studying other towns and learning how they have handled the problem and putting in place some type of limitations on the number of people living in a home based on sleeping space.
<b>Sandy Dillon</b>	I see no need to increase the occupancy limits, especially due to the fact there are so many more rental homes available each season.
<b>John Hancock</b>	I think this is an area that needs to be given a lot of thought.. We may want to adopt something along the lines of Ocean Isle using road frontage footage and total lot square footage in determining the formula for occupancy limits. It seems to me that if you are going to pay a million dollars for an ocean front lot, you ought to be able to build a house that will bring a suitable return on your investment.
<b>John Heimlich</b>	The above two restrictions go a long in controlling structure size. However I am open to ideas and discussions to maintain the Towns character.
<b>Alan Holden</b>	I support the laws of N.C., which address this issue. I support the right of owners to have guests and family provided the owners provide legal treatment of wastewater generated. Rules and regulations should apply to all. I don't want neighbors at Christmas and Thanksgiving counting each other's guests.
<b>Sandy Miller</b>	I do not believe we need occupancy limits on bedrooms once the sewer is operational. Our current height limit and lot coverage restrictions will provide the needed limits on the number of bedrooms.
<b>Pat Sandifer</b>	I am in favor of some limitation on occupancy. What that number is should be determined by holding public hearings on that subject.
<b>Gary Staley</b>	We should not rush into imposing occupancy limits on homeowners after sewer becomes operational just because the current limit will go away. If we see a problem developing after sewer is running, we could address it at that time
<b>Grady Watkins</b>	I would have to investigate if the town could legally impost a restriction on occupancy. If we did who would enforce the ordinance. Is our current restrictions being enforced now? Would we expect our law enforcement officers to do head counts in our vacation homes. I just do not know how we could implement such a limitation.

## 2005 Candidate Responses

Candidate	The need for a 1% land/property transfer tax in Brunswick County
<b>Jim Lowell</b>	Everywhere I have lived has had such a tax and it has not hurt business. It would certainly help Holden Beach's revenue and possibly applied to beach renourishment and maybe canal dredging projects. On a county level it makes more sense since the county must provide more and more services as more and more people move here. In Mr. Sandifer's original proposal 1/3 would go for education, 1/3 for sewer (which would have helped our costs), and 1/3 to the towns based on land value (again a help).
<b>Norman Meares</b>	I support the opportunity for the voters of Brunswick County to decide on this issue. If the voters so choose this tax could help schools, beach renourishment and storm water run off.
<b>Jack Smith</b>	This is a very complex question. It is an issue that sounds good on the surface, but the devil is in the details. I have concerns with applying a tax to a specific group. I have more concerns about what happens when the tax collected falls short. We all know Brunswick county is growing and the tax base is growing along with it. I think at this point, I would not want to rush into a transfer tax. I would rather see how well the increase in tax base supports the county operating cost. Once a tax is in place and the money stream realized, getting it removed becomes very difficult.
<b>Charlie Boyle</b>	If the transfer tax goes into the General Fund, I am not in favor of this tax, however, if the money is designated to a Special Project that would be beneficial to the community, I might be able to support this tax.
<b>Sandy Dillon</b>	Let's leave well enough alone and review this particular tax in two years.
<b>John Hancock</b>	I would be against taxing our citizens any further. Our county is and has been the number one county in North Carolina for real estate sales. With the drastic increase in land values, I think the county is receiving a much greater amount of taxes from us already.
<b>John Heimlich</b>	Not a simple issue. I would hope the rapidly expanding tax base in the County would provide adequate revenue.
<b>Alan Holden</b>	Holden Beach owners like other Brunswick County beach property owners pay a very disproportional share of the county taxes. This would be another method of even more of the same because the mass of acreage of the mainland is less valuable and sells fewer times. I oppose Holden Beach owners being burdened more.
<b>Sandy Miller</b>	This land/property transfer tax is almost a red herring. Most of the real estate industry is opposed to this tax and they have a very strong influence in the General Assembly so the idea of the Delegates and Senators allowing Brunswick County to impose this tax is "slim or none." The main argument in favor of this tax is that this tax is needed for the additional burden on the infrastructure (roads and schools) due to the influx of new residents; however, the tax would apply to both new sales and resales. Young people and those with moderate incomes would not be able to afford to purchase property. This tax would also apply to land being passed down from generation to generation. If additional money is absolutely necessary, I believe a fairer tax would be an impact fee only on new houses.
<b>Pat Sandifer</b>	This could only happen with a local bill at the state level. If the income from this would be applied to beach nourishment and capital debt service on our sewer project, then I may be in favor.
<b>Gary Staley</b>	I am not in favor of a transfer tax unless I could be convinced it would lower our property tax to offset the cost to homeowners. We are all taxed to death as it is, and as a general rule, I do not favor any tax increases or new taxes unless ABSOLUTELY necessary. I must point out that our Board of Commissioners has no power to vote in a transfer tax, even if it wanted to. That would take a vote of our state legislature, and only after a unanimous vote of support from our County Board of Commissioners.
<b>Grady Watkins</b>	I am opposed to a land transfer tax for the following reasons: It targets a specific class of people (home buyers). It would increase costs of both new and existing homes by 2-4%. It is not a reliable source of income, would vary with home sales activity. What benefit would Holden Beach have from such a tax?

## 2005 Candidate Responses

Candidate	The need for additional measures to control speed on Ocean Blvd (e.g., speed bumps)
<b>Jim Lowell</b>	Speed on Ocean Boulevard is best controlled by responsible drivers and our public safety department. Speed bumps on a state road are not a possibility and Ocean Boulevard is state.
<b>Norman Meares</b>	Ocean Blvd. is a state owned road and the state controls the speed. I do support additional safety measures on Ocean Blvd. I don't think speed bumps are the answer but working with DOT to get crosswalks at public access ways would help. The Holden Beach police department does a very good job patrolling our streets and our speed limits.
<b>Jack Smith</b>	OBW is a NC highway, so any modifications would require their approval. I am not in favor of speed bumps, or similar devices that would have a negative impact on emergency response time. The best way to control the speed on OBW is to get back to the basics, Police patrolling, Radar monitoring, police visibility and ticket writing for offenders. I believe if it is known that if you speed you will be ticketed, will help control the speeding on OBW.
<b>Charlie Boyle</b>	I am not in favor of "speed bumps" as Ocean Boulevard is the most direct route for emergency vehicles to travel from one end of the island to the other and "speed bumps" would add minutes to the response time of emergency vehicles There are several ways to study the percentage of speeders along Ocean Boulevard and one of these could be used to determine the need for setting up radar points and issuing tickets. If the community feels the problem is significant at this time, radar points could be set up without a study and the police officers could issue tickets to speeders.
<b>Sandy Dillon</b>	I am totally against speed bumps. I think our Police Department does a sufficient job of handing speeder's.
<b>John Hancock</b>	Perhaps stepped up police patrol of Ocean Boulevard could help solve this problem. I might be in favor of a limited amount of speed bumps only after other avenues were exhausted. I just do not think that tourist or residents would react favorably to speed bumps. To my knowledge, no other beach community in our area has gone in this direction.
<b>John Heimlich</b>	Speed bumps are not a good idea----from the standpoint of impeding emergency vehicles if nothing else. Strict police enforcement is the best answer. Also, I do not think State DOT would allow such.
<b>Alan Holden</b>	Ocean Boulevard is a state road and the Town of Holden Beach cannot put speed bumps or any other type of physical barrier on the road. The state of N.C. regulations govern this road.
<b>Sandy Miller</b>	I do not support the addition of speed bumps on Ocean Boulevard. Most people obey the current speed limits. Our police department does an excellent job of enforcing the speed limits.
<b>Pat Sandifer</b>	As per N.C.D.O.T. speed bumps are not allowed on state roads. I do believe additional measures are necessary and would suggest more signage and enforcement.
<b>Gary Staley</b>	Ocean Blvd is a state owned and maintained road. The DOT does not allow speed bumps on state owned roads. The most effective tool we have for this problem is our local police department. There is no reason they can not step up their enforcement of the speed limit on Ocean Blvd, and ticket anyone who speeds—regardless of who they are.
<b>Grady Watkins</b>	While excess speed and safety are a concern on OBW I do not think speed bumps are a solution. I would check with DOT to see what they would suggest for our situation and what our police chief would recommend.

## 2005 Candidate Responses

Candidate	Some property owners feel land currently zoned as conservation should not be touched by developers. Others believe individual property rights should prevail when rezoning requests are considered. In your opinion, which element carries more weight, land conservation or property rights?
<b>Jim Lowell</b>	Conservation zoning was not put in place lightly or by whim. A lot of research and a lot of discussion took place with CAMA, other state and county agencies, and even federal authorities who protect endangered species that visit our wetlands. Any attempt to change all this should also go through the same review by all those in charge. I doubt they will capitulate, but if someone wants to go to the expense of trying, so be it. It should be made a very costly exercise - in futility.
<b>Norman Meares</b>	If a property was originally zoned as residential and changed to conservation, it could be difficult to change it back to residential. The Corps of Engineers and Cama are in existence to protect environmental regulations. I would heavily weigh their input on these issues accordingly. I do feel that what makes Holden Beach great is our mixture of residential and wetlands.
<b>Jack Smith</b>	Holden Beach has a Zoning Plan and Land use Plan. These documents were developed with a lot of care and consideration. There are measures in place to contest zoning changes. There is only so much land on Holden Beach that is protected under the conservation zone. We need to be good stewards of this precious space that is irreplaceable. It concerns me to think we could be so reckless as to lose these precious spaces for greed, rather than maintaining them for future generations. We all saw what the negative impact on New Orleans due to it's loss of wet lands at the mouth of the Mississippi. To summarize, stewardship of our natural resources is an important responsibility of government
<b>Charlie Boyle</b>	I strongly believe in preserving the "wetlands", but I feel that the town or a "concerned group" that could solicit funds from private donations should purchase the land from the owners.
<b>Sandy Dillon</b>	Land conservation always, carries more weight with me. You can always increase the population, but never, can you make more land.
<b>John Hancock</b>	This question always evokes a lot of emotion on both sides of the Issue. I really feel that I do not know enough about the facts surrounding the conservation issue on the west end of the island. To answer your question however, I do feel that property rights should normally carry more weight. I am just one of those people that has a hard time with government telling a land owner what they can and cannot do with their own land.
<b>John Heimlich</b>	I support doing the max in creating/preserving open spaces and conservation areas. However, the Town must procede very carefully in dealing with private property. The Town could face considerable liability in damages/costs with courts looking unfavorably at denying property rights.
<b>Alan Holden</b>	The Town of Holden Beach does have some controls but a majority of the control is by the State of N.C. and the U.S. Government. Holden Beach has no jurisdiction over these and other state and federal regulations. Owners can use methods within the regulations to satisfy requirements that may allow development of property that seems to often make no sense. The existing laws apply to various conditions that determine the owner's rights. I would look at each case. Remember only months ago the Town was considering walkways and other improvements in the marsh for the public as demanded by the public
<b>Sandy Miller</b>	Conservation and property rights do not have to be in conflict. I support the premise that keeping areas designated as conservation remain in conservation. In addition to the aesthetic value of conservation areas, our wetlands and marshes are necessary for storm water runoff as well as a natural habitat for animals and plants. I feel that these areas are essential to the overall image of Holden Beach. I do not think we need any more restrictive measures but I certainly am not in favor of less restrictive requirements.
<b>Pat Sandifer</b>	In general I am in favor of as much conservation/green area on Holden Beach as possible. When possible, I would be more restrictive, if it does not cost the town too dearly.
<b>Gary Staley</b>	I support maintaining conservation areas where at all possible. There could be instances in the future when ones property rights might prevail in court over our desire for conservation, but that would be for the courts to decide if it ended up there. The new board must do all it legally can to preserve and protect any conservation areas and promote the development of all green and natural areas where possible.
<b>Grady Watkins</b>	I am a strong advocate for private property rights. However I believe that if a piece of property is being considered for rezoning to conversation the owner should stand up and oppose the rezoning at that time. I do not think that it is proper for an individual to come back many years later and want to get the property rezoned back to residential because the property values have risen substaneously.

## 2005 Candidate Responses

Candidate	Our beach requires constant renourishment. In order to assure we have sufficient funds to properly maintain our beach, how do you feel about the town increasing the current occupancy tax? (The town receives 5 of the 6% Occupancy Tax charged to renters, and 3 of the 5% is used for beach re nourishment.)
<b>Jim Lowell</b>	To change the percentage of Occupancy tax, the town would have to go through the county to Raleigh who imposes and sets the tax. Recently, some of our neighbors to the north went through a lot to just get a bigger share of the tax.
<b>Norman Meares</b>	I feel the town currently receives adequate funds through occupancy taxes to protect our beach. So long as we continue to commit ourselves and our funds to protecting our beach, what we currently receive is adequate. The first priority for these funds should be our beach.
<b>Jack Smith</b>	It would be nice to increase the occupancy tax rate, but the 6% is set by the State and to change it would require special legislation, not likely to happen. The beach fund, aka BPART fund, is doing well. According to Mr. Wheeler, we have approximately \$1m in reserve for the 50 year plan and approximately \$1.3m to pay for the current renourishment program being permitted at this time. We have also purchased some 43 acres of land near the beach and have had the sand certified as "beach quality" for use as a donor site. This will lower the cost/square yard and will get us on the beach quicker in case of an emergency. All in all, I feel our renourishment plan is pretty good, and has not caused any tax increases.
<b>Charlie Boyle</b>	The State maximum for occupancy tax is 6% and therefore we could not increase the amount of the occupancy tax unless the State changes the law. The other 2% of the occupancy tax goes to Tourist related items (i.e., second garbage pick-up during the summer). At the end of the year, if there are any funds left over from the 2% of the Occupancy Tax, these funds could be transferred to the re-nourishment of the beaches fund.
<b>Sandy Dillon</b>	At this time I am inclined to say let's leave the current occupancy tax alone.
<b>John Hancock</b>	In general, I would not be in favor of a occupancy tax increase. With that said, I realize that maintaining our beaches is of vital importance to our tourism industry. I would be willing to consider an increase only after we explored other ways to finance the project. Even though the tax increase in this situation affects virtually only the tourist, I have a hard time increasing taxes regardless of the source.
<b>John Heimlich</b>	Such an increase along with forthcoming sewer charges could put considerable pressure on property owners in the rental market. Also, a modest increase in that tax does not even begin to meet costs in case of a major erosion event.
<b>Alan Holden</b>	The Town does not have the authority to increase the occupancy tax. The N.C. Legislature would make this decision. So far, similar changes have failed to pass
<b>Sandy Miller</b>	I do not believe we need any increase in the occupancy tax earmarked for beach nourishment. I made the motion to increase the amount from 2% to 3%. The remaining 2% is needed for the beach patrol, maintaining beach access walkways, the second garbage pick-up during the summer, providing the garbage rollback and many other necessary projects that benefit us as well as our visitors.
<b>Pat Sandifer</b>	The enacting legislation that allows collection of occupancy tax is capped at 6%. Any change would require a new bill. I believe that raising that limit would put us at a competitive disadvantage. Neither our neighboring beaches nor our neighboring counties are charging that high of a percentage.
<b>Gary Staley</b>	The state legislature currently has a limit on the occupancy tax of 6%. We are charging the maximum allowed by state law. Our board of commissioners does not have the power to impose any increases. All we could do, if interested, would be to ask the state legislature to consider an increase. I am told that such a request would have little chance of approval at this time.
<b>Grady Watkins</b>	Our share of the occupancy tax amounts to \$916,600. a year. The town could use all of the 5% towards beach renourishment if needed. We currently have 3 projects scheduled for the next three years with costs of about \$850,000 each. We have roughly \$3 million in the fund now. \$1 million of that amount is being earmarked for the 50-year project, which leaves \$2 million for renourishment projects. Once we get into the 50 yr project our projected costs would be aprox. \$850,000 - \$900,000 every 3 - 5 years. If these projections hold true than we will not have to raise the occupancy tax. Holden Beach would be placing around\$550,000 in the renourishment fund every year, which will more than meet our costs.

## 2005 Candidate Responses

Candidate	Would you be in favor of a designated, limited type of commercial zone with boutique / specialty type stores and small restaurants / cafes?
<b>Jim Lowell</b>	Similar proposals have been made to the owners of commercial property on the beach. They clearly do not want town hall telling them what to do with their land. Also the Land Use Plan prohibits adding commercial land if that is what might be further suggested by the question.. So, no!
<b>Norman Meares</b>	We have commercially zoned areas on Holden Beach. The property owner should have the opportunity to develop this property according to the highest and best use. As the owner they have this right.
<b>Jack Smith</b>	I see no reason to designate any commercial property area for any specific type of business. The property owners will decide how to develop their property into the type of business they feel would be profitable and suitable to them. There are ordinances in place to regulate the categories of activities allowed.
<b>Charlie Boyle</b>	The only limitation that I feel should be placed on the commercial area is the commercial establishment should be in keeping with the image of the "Family Beach" that Holden Beach is trying to preserve.
<b>Sandy Dillon</b>	I am not in favor of changing, and/or adding additional commercial zoning on the island. But yet, I would certainly consider limited specialty shops/ eatery's in the current commercial district area on Jordan Blvd. I would do my utmost to insure that they are tastefully done.
<b>John Hancock</b>	If this question intends to limit the businesses referred to above to locate only in the commercial zone and no where else, then I would be against it. If however, we designate a zone for these type businesses in addition to allowing businesses other places, then I could be for it. I just do not want to restrict businesses to a certain area, rather, let the market place along with our Planning and Zoning board guidance dictate and control growth.
<b>John Heimlich</b>	Commercial code already allows such use. Also, its an economic fact that our highly seasonal traffic is not attractive to most retailers with high real estate costs and associated high rental cost.
<b>Alan Holden</b>	There is less business on Holden Beach now than in 1954 when hurricane Hazel hit. Business is leaving the island. The commercial zones are so few and so small I do not consider that the island is being over run. Our existing code defines various requirements for different types of business. The existing code does not treat all business types the same. I would be willing to look at additional codes.
<b>Sandy Miller</b>	We have ordinances on the books banning adult clubs and video gaming establishments in the commercial area. Otherwise, the types of businesses in the commercial zone must be left up to those who own the commercial property. I am NOT in favor of telling them what is the best use of their private property. The only criteria should be that all of the establishments reflect the wholesome, family beach concept.
<b>Pat Sandifer</b>	There is very little commercial property on Holden Beach. I believe that the majority of it will be developed as residential use. I don't believe that further requirements are necessary.
<b>Gary Staley</b>	Taking this question at face value, its nice to imagine such a commercial area, but the reality is what is ultimately built on any commercial property will be determined by the highest and best use to its owner. Many times it is difficult for small, quaint shops/cafes to be profitable in seasonal areas. Towns can get into some sticky, legal issues if it attempts to legislate aesthetics, so we have to be careful in this area. With today's land values being what they are, it would not surprise me if most of the commercial areas ended up being used for residential purposes.
<b>Grady Watkins</b>	It would depend on the location.



## 2005 Candidate Responses

Candidate	What do you feel are the most critical issues facing Holden Beach?
<b>Jim Lowell</b>	<p>The obvious ones are the 5000 or so units already permitted for construction on the mainland to go up in the next 5 years. Add another 5000 with permit requests about to go in or are already in. The issue is how will we maintain the ambiance, the peace, the serenity, the cleanliness of our family beach while providing the necessities which the influx from the mainland will rightfully demand. We will need more space for parking, bathrooms, beach accesses and most of all a larger and better housed department of public safety. There may be funds available for some of this but space for these amenities is the first issue to be addressed.</p> <p>The second issue is a complete review of "after sewer" where are we going? Items such as proper street paving, a new department, and emergency measures from the fixing of a vacuum pump to hurricane and flood procedures.</p>
<b>Norman Meares</b>	<p>Completion of the sewer project and having the property owners hooked up to the system in a timely manner and understanding the cost involved.</p> <p>We have purchased a track of land which is compatible with our beach sand for beach renourishment, but we will continue to seek assistance from the Corps of Engineers with this project.</p> <p>It is very important that we investigate options for storm water run off for our streets and low areas on the island.</p> <p>It is important to keep our beach a clean, safe and happy family beach for residents and tourists.</p>
<b>Jack Smith</b>	<p>The outstanding issue in my opinion, is storm water dispersal. There is no easy answer to this issue, given the regulatory restraints as to where storm water can be placed. The NC State studies I am working with, if found feasible could provide some reduction in rain run off at a very low cost and doable by an individual home owner. Other areas to explore is to obtain space for runoff retention along OBW. Also we can explore a venture with the Corp of Engineers to utilize some of the spoil islands to pump runoff into for filtration and leaching back in to the waterway. In all probability, the solution to storm water run off does not lay in a single massive solution, but in a number of smaller more cost effective solutions.</p>
<b>Charlie Boyle</b>	<p>Future Planning for the increase population of Holden Beach (i.e., public facilities such as: parking for day guest and boat parking, entertainment area, governmental facilities and personal, ordinances to protect permanent residents rights, etc.)</p>
<b>Sandy Dillon</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Flooding and proper drainage.</li> <li>2. Lowering Sewage expense.</li> <li>3. Land conservations.</li> <li>4. Beach Renourishment.</li> <li>5. No more taxes.</li> <li>6. Working to keep Lockwood Folly Inlet open.</li> </ol>
<b>John Hancock</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Completion of the sewer project in a timely manner.</li> <li>2) Assessing the need to correct our drainage problems so that we do not experience localized flooding on the island as we have seen during the past two storms. We must take care of our residents and property owners to provide for future generations of island dwellers.</li> </ol>
<b>John Heimlich</b>	<p>Beach erosion and sand renourishment needs will never go away. Beyond that, its a matter of anticipating and reacting to change and economics to maintain the character of the Town.</p>
<b>Alan Holden</b>	<p>Infrastructure, density, beach nourishment, canal and waterway maintenance, storm water, maintaining the family beach. The leadership of H.B. must be informed and be able to work with county, state, and federal government through personal contact on a continued basis.</p>
<b>Sandy Miller</b>	<p>Continued beach nourishment and completing the sewer project are critical issues. Developing plans for the covered stage at the end of Jordan Blvd. and continuing to develop plans to create an area in the commercial zone that is conducive to the enjoyment of a visitors and permanent residents.</p> <p>The most immediate critical issue is resolving the tensions that have arisen during this election. The past few months have been an embarrassment to the majority of people on this island. Holden Beach has never been known as a place where backstabbing, finger-pointing, and mud-slinging are the norm. The next board will need to work very hard to heal these wounds and demonstrate to the public that everyone is looking out for the best interest of the entire island.</p>
<b>Pat Sandifer</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maintaining the quality of life we now enjoy.</li> <li>2. Effective storm water management.</li> <li>3. Keeping taxes at a rate that will allow us to continue to live here.</li> </ol>
<b>Gary Staley</b>	<p>Keeping our low key, hometown, family atmosphere amid all of the growth and building boom will be a major challenge in our future. Accompanying this growth are other potential issues such as increased traffic problems, parking scarcity, police protection and public facility shortfalls. We must maintain a constant search for funding and creative ways to continue our beach renourishment program.</p> <p>Don't forget that all Brunswick County property values will be reassessed in 2007, which will be on the upcoming new boards watch. Yes, this is a county issue, but we are in the county and will be directly affected not only on the county tax level, but with Holden Beach taxes as well. It's a perfect time for politicians to emphasize lowering your tax rate and at the same time hoping you will ignore your higher tax bill. I will be watching this closely. Regaining total public confidence in our board of commissioners as a whole, is an immediate and pressing need. After this election, everyone needs to be pulling in the same direction, without personal agendas, and with only the good of the town at heart.</p>
<b>Grady Watkins</b>	<p>Completion of the sewer project.</p> <p>Long term planning for beach renourishment.</p> <p>Storm water system of some type.</p> <p>Maintenance of our inlets and waterways.</p> <p>Make sure growth and development will adhere to the family oriented standards that has made Holden Beach what it is today.</p>

## 2005 Candidate Responses

Candidate	How do you envision Holden Beach 5-10 years from now? What actions will be required for this vision to become a reality?
<b>Jim Lowell</b>	If the influx of day visitors is addressed with aplomb and the impact is spatially broadened, I would hope that Holden Beach will be little changed in 5-10 years.
<b>Norman Meares</b>	Holden Beach continuing to flourish as a nationally acclaimed family beach. A small, strong commercial area, with a beautified Jordan Blvd. to enhance the attractiveness of the area. In order to do this, we must commit to projects that we feel strongly about, and continue to look at ways to improve and protect our island. The town officials and the residents of Holden Beach working together can continue to make our island an outstanding place to live and visit.
<b>Jack Smith</b>	I would like to think of Holden Beach 5 to 10 years from now similar to how it is today, but that's impossible, changes will occur, but we will continue to be a residential family beach town. I foresee more commercial development, some small stores and shops, maybe another restaurant or cafe. The commercial area will be mostly developed as residential, condominium/town houses. There will be a continuing recycling of older smaller homes for new larger homes. There will be a major development on the main land causeway and ETJ and/or annexation could become an issue. Some of these visions will not be welcomed by all, but with public support of existing ordinances and careful guidance by Town officials, much of today's quality of life and style of living can be retained. I hope so because I would like to live out my days right where I am now on Frigate Drive.
<b>Charlie Boyle</b>	Presently Holden Beach is two-thirds developed with most of the remaining one-third being developed over the next 5 to 10 years. Careful attention must be paid to the future development so services can be furnished future residents, both permanent as well as renters and the integrity of Holden Beach maintained. If the present trend continues, Holden Beach will have a larger percentage of permanent residents. To insure that this trend continues, the current ordinances of height limit, lot coverage, set backs and commercial area limitations must be kept in place
<b>Sandy Dillon</b>	A. Hopefully, an affordable Family Beach, as it has always been. B. Restrictive zoning has always been the "Key" to maintaining Holden Beach the Family Beach.
<b>John Hancock</b>	I still see Holden Beach as a wholesome, family beach destination for vacationers. I also see it as a little piece of heaven for those of us who have chosen to live and retire here. As the population of our island grows, we must embrace new business to our area. With growth, businesses will follow... make no mistake about it. Instead of fighting growth, we must control it for the benefit of all. We must also maintain our town in an effort to draw more residents that are permanent. Certainly we do not want to become an "investor island" suitable only for the wealthy. Together, we can keep our little piece of heaven a great place to live and work and raise our children.
<b>John Heimlich</b>	It will still be a residential community mostly single family. There will be no down zoning. More public spaces should be created, eg, the Jordan Blvd project and pocket parks, playgrounds, fishing piers, etc. Good management, planning and reaction to change are key. Unforeseen situations or problems must be dealt with quickly and decisively
<b>Alan Holden</b>	I see H.B. pretty much the same but with a few more houses. The sidewalks, road shoulders, street and other areas will be in good condition post sewer installation. The appearance of H.B. should be the best ever as our owners seem to be taking more pride in their homes and yards each year. I do not see high rises and commercialization on the island. We must continue to focus on the "Family Beach" image
<b>Sandy Miller</b>	I would like to see Holden Beach remain a place where families will continue to enjoy the quiet, restful, non-glitzy surroundings. Conservation areas must be maintained. More residential areas are inevitable but I hope a few of the old-fashioned beach cottages will be still be here 5-10 years from now. I hope the ban on neon lights in the commercial area will still be in place. I would also like to see more public park areas similar to the one at the end of Halstead. Zoning laws, height restrictions and lot coverage limits must be tightly enforced.
<b>Pat Sandifer</b>	Holden Beach is approximately 65 to 70 % developed. With the number of houses we build each year, we will be completely built out within the 5-10 year period. I envision Holden Beach maintaining its present life style and being "home" as well as a "resort". Strong planning and a will to say no to uncontrolled growth.
<b>Gary Staley</b>	Many of the basic, desirable traits of Holden Beach that we all enjoy do not depend on actions---they depend on NO action. By that I mean no action to change the height limits, no action to raise taxes, no action to increase lot coverage. Even if our local board does not have the power to change some of these things, we should always be alert to those who might attempt to have them changed for personal gain and not the good of the town. We must resist any action that would tend to take away from the quiet, relatively tranquil feeling we enjoy from day to day on our island. Building codes must be enforced for everyone---regardless of who you are. Law enforcement must be efficient and fair to everyone---regardless of who you are. Government leaders must be honest, open and equal to everyone---at all times. With sewer upon us, there will be more and larger homes on the island, but that aside, I envision Holden Beach 5 to 10 years from now with no major changes in our life style. If anyone desires glitz, neon, high rises, loud noises and heavy traffic, Myrtle Beach is to our south and Wilmington is to the north. Lets do all we can to keep it off of our island.
<b>Grady Watkins</b>	My vision of Holden Beach 5 – 10 years from now is not very different than the way we see it today. Obviously we will continue to see growth but we have to make sure that it follows the pattern that has been in place for the last 40 to 50 years. A place where families can come and make memories that last for generations. I see a community with a modern sewer system, a storm water system, a new town hall all the citizens would be proud of, a family park that would be designed around the bridge area that would beautify that part of the island and a healthy beach which is what draws us all here. We will have to have leadership with a forward proactive agenda. Not one that just reacts. We need leadership that has experience with budgets, personnel, strategic planning, fiscal responsibility and some common sense. We also will need our citizens to be well informed and active in the community.