



Town of Hilton Head Island
Planning Commission
LMO Rewrite Committee Meeting

October 24, 2013

8:30 a.m.

Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers

AGENDA

As a Courtesy to Others Please Turn Off All Cell Phones and Pagers during the Meeting.

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Freedom of Information Act Compliance**
Public notification of this meeting has been published, posted, and mailed in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Town of Hilton Head Island requirements.
- 3. Approval of the Agenda**
- 4. Approval of the Minutes** – October 16, 2013 Meeting
- 5. Unfinished Business**
- 6. New Business**
 - a. Committee input on various items
- 7. Adjournment**

Please note that a quorum of Town Council may result if four (4) or more of Town Council members attend this workshop.

TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND
Planning Commission
LMO REWRITE COMMITTEE MEETING

Draft

October 16, 2013 Minutes
9:00a.m. – Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: Chairman Tom Crews, Vice Chairman Gail Quick, David Ames, David Bachelder, Irv Campbell, Chris Darnell, Jim Gant, Walter Nester, and Charles Cousins, *Ex-Officio*

Committee Members Absent: Kim Likins, *Ex-Officio*

Planning Commissioners Present: Tom Lennox

Town Council Members Present: Lee Edwards

Town Staff Present: Teri Lewis, LMO Official
Jennifer Ray, Urban Designer
Shawn Colin, Deputy Director, Community Development
Brian Hulbert, Staff Attorney
Kathleen Carlin, Administrative Assistant

- 1) **CALL TO ORDER**
Chairman Crews called today's meeting to order at 9:00a.m.
- 2) **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT**
Public notification of this meeting has been published, posted and mailed in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and Town of Hilton Head Island requirements.
- 3) **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
The committee **approved** the agenda as presented by general consent.
- 4) **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**
The committee **approved** the minutes of the October 10, 2013 meeting as presented by general consent.
- 5) **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
None
- 6) **NEW BUSINESS**
Review of proposed Coligny Resort District standards
Chairman Crews presented introductory comments regarding today's review of the proposed Coligny Resort District standards and requested that staff make their presentation. Ms. Lewis presented a brief overview of the recommendations presented by the committee at previous meetings. As a

result of the committee's past discussions, the Coligny District boundaries have been tightened up a little and, for the most part, includes the core area along Pope Avenue.

At a previous meeting, the committee discussed allowing 35 hotel rooms anywhere that hotels are allowed rather than only the Coligny Resort District. The committee also talked about allowing 12,000 sq. ft. for commercial density and 12 – 16 dwelling units for residential multi-family.

As a result of that discussion, the committee requested that staff go back and perform some testing of a couple of sites such as Coligny Plaza and Heritage Plaza. The committee stated they wanted to see how the numbers would work (to check if the numbers are too high, too low, or about right.)

Ms. Lewis stated that several members of the staff met recently with the property owners of both Coligny Plaza and Heritage Plaza to get input from them as well. Ms. Jennifer Ray has completed some testing of a couple of sites at both Heritage Plaza and at Coligny Plaza to what would fit with regard to the setbacks, buffers, and build-to line that are being proposed including parking and open space requirements. Ms. Lewis requested that Ms. Ray make her presentation.

Ms. Ray stated the following numbers are the result of staff's testing at Coligny Plaza and Heritage Plaza sites:

Retail =
+/- 13,000 – 15,000 square feet per acre

Hotel =
+/- 30 rooms per acre (3 stories)

Multi-family =
+/- 22 – 30 units per acre (3 stories)
+/- 35 units per acre (4 stories)

Hotel =
+/- 650 square feet per standard room
+/- 950 square feet per luxury room
Parking = 1 space per room

Multi-family = 1,000 square feet per two bedroom unit
Parking = 1.15 space per unit

Retail parking = 1 space per 425 square feet

Open space = 20% minimum
15-ft. build-to-zone

Ms. Ray stated the real limiting factors are parking, open space and height.

Mr. Darnell and Ms. Lewis stated that the existing is approaching double of what it is currently permitted in the code. Mr. Gant stated that what we are proposing to provide them in density already exists; we are making a non-conforming use a conforming use.

Mr. Darnell asked “What is our vision for these areas?” Changes we make to the ordinance should address the vision that we have for these areas. Vice Chairman Quick agreed with Mr. Darnell’s comment. The idea of only eliminating a non-conformity may not be the right thing to do. The committee discussed the open space issue - 20% open space in an urban area may not be a bad thought.

Chet Williams presented comments in support of providing strong incentives for redevelopment in these two areas. The Town should consider providing a municipal parking garage either on site or off site so that on-site parking requirements can be eliminated. Mr. Nester responded with comments regarding parking requirements and the idea of a municipal parking garage. Mr. Nester asked for additional input from staff regarding additional flexibility.

Ms. Ray presented comments regarding building a parking garage in Coligny Plaza. The idea is to have parking going up instead of out.

Mr. Nester presented comments regarding parking standards in an urban-like district. Perhaps we should reduce the required parking standards in an urban area if we anticipate that people are walking and biking. The standards should be different for Coligny than all of the other districts. Ms. Lewis stated that this is already being done by the consultants.

Ms. Ray discussed the findings of the testing and stated that parking is an issue right now with more square footage – this may lend itself to other problems. Mr. Ames presented comments regarding open space, drainage, and parking requirements in these locations. Mr. Ames stated that the space we want down there is more urbanized than just a subdivision of urban entities. How do you get the private sector to contribute in some way to the public sector’s financial requirement for infrastructure?

Mr. Cousins presented comments regarding his recent meetings with the property owners of Coligny Plaza and Heritage Plaza. The staff asked what if we gave you more density if you had your parking someplace else. The answer has always been that they want their parking provided right in front of their doors. Mr. J.R. Richardson has stated that he does not want any parking standard requirements (he wants to be able to build the same parking that he has right now.) The committee’s ideas are great but how do you entice their implementation? How do you get the property owners on board?

Mr. Shawn Colin presented statements with regard to recent meetings with Mr. J.R. Richardson with regard to surface parking vs. vertical parking. Mr. Richardson stated that they are happy with what they have right now.

Mr. Campbell presented statements in support of educating the public – create a model so that landowners and property owners can understand what the Town would like to do with development/redevelopment. Let them see the potential of development/redevelopment so that they have a better understanding of what can be done.

Mr. Gant stated that to a great extent we are talking about what the LMO will allow in an area if someone were so inclined (along with a set of standards of what you must do.) Mr. Cousins stated that we can set the stage for the future. Someday someone will come along who will want to redevelop the sites.

Chairman Crews asked “what is the character that the committee wants to see in the area?” What is the goal for the community in the future? Chairman Crews presented comments in support of a good pedestrian village. This is an opportunity to create the matrix for the characterization of what the area could become in the next 20 - 30 years. Let the design standards lead the way instead of worrying about density requirements. Parking requirements can be reduced if you participate in a public/private incentive partnership for parking and stormwater retention. There are a lot of things that can be done.

Mr. Ames stated that we need to extend our best efforts – the consultant may or may not have the expertise to get something like this in front of the committee for their evaluation. But if they do, when it gets to the Planning Commission and Town Council levels, it’s going to be a big decision for them to decide – a very big responsibility. Mr. Bachelder and Mr. Gant presented statements with regard to a parking structure. Mr. Nester stated that he is not as much of a proponent of trading off. There is a cost to participate in a municipal parking garage – bonus reduction of parking requirement- but this may not be a real incentive.

Mr. Colin presented statements regarding the Coligny site – 15,000 -16,000 sq. ft. per acre probably exceeds the current parking standards. You need someplace to accommodate the parking. The committee and Mr. Colin discussed the goal for the Coligny District. It needs a good mix – retail, residential, and hotel. Right now it always seems to be one or the other.

The committee and staff discussed the issues of height requirements, density requirements, and the build-to line. They also discussed private/public partnerships. A central parking area for pedestrian use seems to be a good idea. There’s an opportunity to require some shared costs for a parking structure. We should back away from the requirement that people park in front of their stores.

The committee discussed giving incentives to outdoor areas because these are the areas that give energy. We should allow room in the LMO for this potential. We need to solve the parking issue - allow off-site parking. Ms. Lewis stated that the committee also needs to decide the height requirement (currently 45-feet – should it be increased to 60-ft?) The committee discussed issues such as an angled setback, open space, and a 60-ft. height limit. The pedestrian experience has to be protected.

Vice Chairman Quick stated that she is opposed to increasing the height requirement from 45-ft. to 60-ft. Ms. Ray and the committee discussed three-story parking (ground plus three stories). 75-ft. is the current limit allowed on beach front.

The staff and the committee discussed the boundaries of the district. What are the limits? Mr. Crews presented an overhead map and review of the district. Mr. Cousins also presented comments regarding the district boundaries.

The Committee directed staff to ask Clarion Associates to work on some changes to the Coligny Resort District standards keeping in mind the following:

- Make the height 60’ but with step back/setback angle requirements for any building over two stories (this will protect the pedestrian experience)
- Consider whether to eliminate specific open space, parking, pervious and impervious standards for this district
- What incentives/credits could be given for someone that puts a parking structure on their site
- Incentivize (or at least don’t penalize) outdoor areas (such as plazas, outdoor dining, etc.)

- Either eliminate parking requirements or have them at some % less (such as 50%) to encourage public/private partnership participation in a parking structure
- Eliminate all density caps in this district but establish a minimum size for rooms.

7) **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40a.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Kathleen Carlin
Administrative Assistant

Tom Crews
Chairman

DRAFT



TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND

Community Development Department

TO: LMO Rewrite Committee
FROM: Teri Lewis, *LMO Official*
DATE: October 18, 2013
SUBJECT: October 24th LMO Rewrite Committee Meeting

As I go through the Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and my notes, I find that there are various items that I need further clarification on from the committee. These items as well as next steps forward will be discussed at the meeting on October 24th.