



Town of Hilton Head Island
Planning Commission
LMO Rewrite Committee Meeting
May 16, 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 – April 25, 2013 and May 9, 2013 Meetings**
- 5. New Business**
 - a. Review of the I-MX-Coligny, RD, COM-MX, WMU and SMU zoning districts
- 6. 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

April 25, 2013 Minutes

8:30a.m. – Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: Chairman Tom Crews, David Ames, Irv Campbell, Chris Darnell, Jim Gant, Kim Likins, *Ex-Officio*; and Charles Cousins, *Ex-Officio*

Committee Members Absent: Vice Chairman Quick, David Bachelder, Walter Nester

Planning Commissioners Present: Tom Lennox

Town Council Members Present: Lee Edwards

Town Staff Present: Teri Lewis, LMO Official
Jill Foster, Deputy Director of Community Development
Kathleen Carlin, Administrative Assistant

1) CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Crews called the meeting to order at 8:30a.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 April 11, 2013 meeting as presented by general consent.

5) UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Edge Conditions

Chairman Crews welcomed the public and presented opening comments regarding today's Unfinished Business item, Edge Conditions. Following these comments, Chairman Crews requested that Ms. Teri Lewis make her presentation on behalf of staff.

Ms. Lewis stated that the committee met on April 11th and had an extensive discussion related to edge conditions. The staff has summarized the April 11th discussion so that the committee can review the proposed recommendations to Clarion related to edge conditions. The committee's discussion and associated recommendations are as follows:

- (1) Edge conditions are addressed in the current LMO through buffers, setbacks, tree protection and Design Review Board (DRB) review.
- (2) There is a difference between internal edges (private property) versus external edges (public property).
- (3) The edge is defined by the separation of two land uses or the separation of two ecosystems.
- (4) Edge conditions along and between waterways, roadways and dissimilar uses should receive priority status.
- (5) Beef up the purpose statements in the buffer, setback, tree protection and DRB sections to reflect the importance of edge conditions.
- (6) Develop an 'Edge Conditions' section of the LMO. **
- (7) Create a sliding scale of buffers based on either character, the size of the parcel, the location of the parcel, the size of structures on the parcel or the use of the property.**
- (8) Keep the existing buffers and setbacks between dissimilar uses.

As discussed on April 11th, Clarion needs specific recommendations from the committee in order to adequately address edge conditions. The above referenced items # 6 and # 7 need to be discussed in greater detail while keeping the following important points in mind:

- (1) We are trying to create an LMO that is flexible and easier to read with information in a logical location – will separating out 'edge conditions' into a separate section still accomplish this or is it possible to beef up various purpose statements with information about why edge conditions are important and keep buffers, setbacks and tree protections in more intuitive locations?
- (2) In relation to the creation of a 'sliding scale' how do you logically determine where the buffer is less or more simply based on size of a structure, location of the parcel or use of the parcel? This is likely to create discord among Hilton Head Island property owners.
- (3) What roles do buffers play in trying to encourage redevelopment yet also protect our edges – we need to ensure that the recommendations of the committee accomplish both.

The committee discussed the above points with the staff. The committee agreed with the staff's recommendation to beef up the Purpose Statements, particularly as they relate to edge conditions. A separate chapter on Edge Conditions is not recommended.

As part of the discussion on edge conditions, Mr. Campbell stated that the committee needs to refer to the R/UDAT Study when discussing edge conditions in Ward 1. Mr. Campbell discussed the Ward 1 Master Plan and the need to work more effectively with property owners in Ward 1, particularly in the Chaplin and Stony neighborhoods. Mr. Cousins and Mr. Campbell discussed the Ward 1 Master Plan including setback and buffer conditions.

Ms. Lewis and the committee discussed setback and buffer requirements along Highway 278 in the Ward 1 area. The committee requested that the staff provide an aerial map of the area showing the street buffer. The committee discussed protecting the single-family environment while still encouraging some commercial development in the area. Commercial development on a piece of property might change the character of the existing neighborhood. The committee presented comments related to preserving the architecture and character of single-family homes in Chaplin and Stony. Mr. Cousins presented statements regarding different regulations for commercial and residential property that is located inside and outside of gated

communities (specifically as related to commercial establishments.) This completed today's discussion on edge conditions.

The staff and the committee discussed next steps for future committee meetings. Chairman Crews and Ms. Lewis recommended that the meeting schedule be increased to once a week for the next couple of months (May and June.) The staff and the committee will re-evaluate the meeting schedule after this time. The committee agreed to meet once a week during this time. Staff will contact the committee members with the revised meeting schedule and associated list of topics. All committee meetings will begin at 8:30a.m.

Ms. Lewis then distributed copies of draft Chapters 3 and 4 (Zoning Districts, Use Standards, Use Table, and Accessory Uses.) There is a lot of information in these two chapters and staff anticipates that it will take the committee four or five weeks to get through all of the information. Draft Chapter 5 (Design Performance Standards including setbacks, buffers, open space, and stormwater) and Chapter 6 (Natural Resources, wetlands, trees, etc.) and Chapter 7 (Non-conformities) will follow. The committee requested that the consultant provide them with an outline or summary on what has been changed. A summary of changes will be helpful to the Planning Commission and to Town Council as well.

Ms. Lewis also distributed copies of the proposed zoning map from the consultant. Ms. Lewis presented an over-head review of the proposed zoning map. Ms. Lewis and the committee briefly discussed the proposed changes.

6) NEW BUSINESS

None

7) ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 a.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Kathleen Carlin
Administrative Assistant

Tom Crews
Chairman

TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND
Planning Commission
LMO REWRITE COMMITTEE MEETING

DRAFT

May 9, 2013 Minutes

8:30a.m. – Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: David Ames, David Bachelder, Irv Campbell,
Chris Darnell, Jim Gant, Walter Nester,
Kim Likins, *Ex-Officio*; and Charles Cousins, *Ex-Officio*

Committee Members Absent: Chairman Tom Crews and Vice Chairman Gail Quick

Planning Commissioners Present: Alex Brown

Town Council Members Present: None

Town Staff Present: Teri Lewis, LMO Official
Jill Foster, Deputy Director of Community Development
Kathleen Carlin, Administrative Assistant

1) CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:30a.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

Approval of the April 25, 2013 meeting minutes is deferred to May 16, 2013.

5) UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Edge Conditions in the Stoney and Chaplin areas

Ms. Teri Lewis presented a brief history of the committee's previous discussion on edge conditions in the Stoney and Chaplin areas as related to setback and buffer requirements along Highway 278. At the April 25th meeting the committee had requested that staff provide an aerial map of the Stoney and Chaplin areas that shows the street buffer.

Ms. Lewis presented an in-depth overhead review of the aerial maps of Stoney and Chaplin. The staff and committee discussed what the areas look like with the placement of a street buffer. Ms. Lewis identified Town-owned property on the Stoney map. Much of the property in this area along Highway 278 is owned by the Town. At a previous meeting the committee had discussed eliminating the adjacent use buffer between similar

uses. This might allow more development opportunities for property owners.

Ms. Lewis and the committee began their review with a map of Chaplin. Staff and the committee presented comments regarding the narrow parcels in the area. Some of the older property was developed prior to placement of the 60-ft. buffer requirement along Highway 278. Ms. Lewis stated that staff will work with the consultant on developing an Administrative Adjustment process to allow additional flexibility for property owners.

The committee and staff discussed the 20-ft. adjacent use buffer in residential areas. A 20-ft. buffer may be excessive in single-family neighborhoods. Mr. Ames stated his preference for eliminating the adjacent use buffer between similar uses in commercial areas not residential neighborhoods. The Stoney and Chaplin neighborhoods have some residential and commercial uses.

Mr. Campbell asked staff about the reasons for requiring the 60-ft. buffer along Highway 278. Ms. Lewis stated that the requirement is desired because it provides screening and an undisturbed vegetative area. The 60-ft. buffer requirement is for the entire length of Highway 278. Mr. Campbell stated that the large buffer requirement seems unfair to property owners along Highway 278 who would like to develop their property. Mr. Campbell stated that a Special Exception should be available to the property owners along Highway 278 to facilitate subdividing their property.

Chet Williams, Esq., the committee and the staff discussed compliance with the 50-ft. setback along Highway 278 and the 60-ft. buffer along Highway 278. Ms. Lewis stated that the staff tries to be flexible in working with property owners in the Chaplin and Stoney areas. Staff works with these property owners on a case-by-case basis.

Staff and the committee discussed the differences between Major and Minor Arterials (based on traffic volume.) Highway 278 is a Major Arterial. The committee stated concern with developing property within the 60-foot buffer based on safety reasons.

Planning Commissioner Alex Brown presented public comments in support of decreasing the buffer/setback requirements for the property owners in Stoney and Chaplin along Highway 278 so that native islanders have increased opportunities for the development of their land. Mr. Brown stated that buffer and setback requirements need to be more flexible for residential property in this area.

A couple of committee members stated that the purpose of buffer and setback requirements is from the road. Setbacks and buffers should be constant along a particular road or waterway.

Mr. Campbell stated that he would like to see a more equitable process for working with the property owners along Highway 278 with regard to setback and buffer requirements. Ms. Lewis stated that the committee needs to give the consultant some guidance in this area. If the committee would like to see a reduction in setback and buffer requirements, would it be the same for both Chaplin and Stoney? We need to keep in mind that we are trying to simplify the LMO and make it easier to understand.

Mr. Ames presented statements regarding the historical significance of Chaplin and Stoney. Chaplin has an opportunity to become a special place with the creation of an Overlay District for Chaplin. Maybe residential uses should have a 20-ft. buffer everywhere on the island. The Administrative Adjustment process was discussed as it relates to residential. The committee discussed the implications of a 20-ft. setback requirement island wide. The consultant will need a great deal of input from the

committee to help with Chaplin and Stoney.

The committee would like to receive some advice from the consultant in the way of a framework and structure. What are the ramifications of a 20-ft. setback requirement island wide? A couple of committee members stated that adjacent parcels should not have different setbacks. The concept would work in terms of districts. Different districts could have their own look. This is an idea for the consultant.

The committee and staff discussed the possibility of reducing the setback and buffer requirements for Minor Arterials. Mr. Cousins and the committee discussed the Chaplin and Stoney neighborhoods and the location of the sidewalk and pathway. The committee stated that there is a large difference between the areas of Stoney and Chaplin. Chaplin might be an excellent candidate for an Overlay District. The Stoney area seems to be dictated by traffic. Much of Stoney along 278 is owned by the Town.

The committee discussed the possibility of reducing the 50-ft. setback requirement to 30 or 35 feet. A reduction to 20-ft. is not a good idea for safety reasons. Mr. Campbell stated that the property owners in Stoney need to be considered as well as Chaplin. There are traffic and egress problems in Stoney for both residential and commercial property owners. Traffic is a real problem. Much of the property in the Stoney area is owned by the Town and much of it is inhospitable due to the high volume of traffic through the area. Community issues in the Stoney area will dictate the decisions that can be made by the committee. Mr. Campbell encouraged the Town to work harder with property owners in this area. Mr. Cousins presented statements regarding the Town's efforts to work with property owners. The staff works with property owners on a case-by-case basis.

An Overlay District for Chaplin would enrich the island and bring a different element to what people see when they come to Hilton Head Island. The consultant should be able to offer the committee some advice based on their experience. The committee asked staff to request that the consultant advise them on developing parameters for Administrative Adjustments.

The committee and staff commented on several other residential neighborhoods that are located on Minor Arterials. Perhaps the consultant can offer advice on these residential areas as they relate to residential setbacks and buffers. The committee stated that the consultant also needs to consider the quality of the buffer. A reduced buffer will require more vegetation.

Mr. Cousins stated that the character of Stoney and Chaplin will need to be carefully defined for the consultant. The committee discussed the idea of having small focus groups comprised of residents/commercial property owners in the Chaplin area to help develop and define the character of the area. The committee stated that they can continue to work in other areas while the Chaplin community input is being organized. The committee asked Mr. Campbell for his assistance in organizing community input from the Chaplin area. The staff will ask the consultant about developing either a separate zone for Chaplin or a Chaplin Overlay District. Ms. Lewis will forward the committee's comments on residential areas along Minor Arterials as well.

6) NEW BUSINESS

Review of the I-MX-Coligny and RD zoning districts

Ms. Lewis stated that based on time constraints this business item will be reviewed at the May 16, 2013 meeting.

7) ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15a.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: May 2, 2013
SUBJECT: Review of Changes to Proposed and Existing Zoning Districts

At the meeting on May 16th staff will review the **I-MX-Coligny, RD, COM-MX, WMU** and **SMU** zoning districts. We will go over the following:

- where the districts are located on the proposed zoning map
- what uses are allowed in each district and how they are allowed (permitted by right, permitted by condition, requires a special exception)
- definitions associated with particular uses
- proposed height, impervious coverage and density

We will not go over parking requirements, those will be discussed when we review the parking table in Chapter 5.

General Information about the I-MX-Coligny zoning district

- The I-MX-Coligny zoning district is made up of parcels in the existing CCW (Coligny Commercial Walking District) and CFB (Central Forest Beach) zoning districts.
- The proposed district allows residential uses and resort accommodations, the CCW district does not.
 - Residential density is increased from 8 units to 12 units
 - Resort Accommodations density is increased from 25 rooms to 35 rooms
- Maximum impervious coverage is increased from 55% to 65%.
- The height limitation in the CFB zoning district is 45' for parcels greater than 600' from the beach and 75' for parcels within 600' feet of the beach. The height limitation in the CCW zoning district is 45'. The proposed height requirements in the I-MX-Coligny zoning district is 45' for all properties greater than 600' from the beach and 75' for all properties within 600' of the beach. There are five properties (three of which are owned by the Town) that will receive an increase in the height requirements as a result of this change. These parcels will be reviewed at the meeting.
- A build-to zone is included as part of this zoning district.

General Information about the RD zoning district

- The RD zoning district reflects the current boundaries of the existing RD zoning district with the exception of some Town owned parcels that have been changed to the PR zoning district.
- Residential density is increased from 8 units to 12 units
- Resort Accommodations density is increased from 20 rooms to 35 rooms
- Maximum impervious coverage remains the same.
- The height limitation remains the same.

General Information about the COM-MX zoning district

- The COM-MX zoning district is made up of parcels in the existing CC (Central Commercial), OL (Office/Institutional Low Intensity), OCIL (Office/Light Commercial/Light Industrial), OM (Office/Institutional Moderate Intensity), PD1 (Planned Development Mixed Use) DCW (Dunnagan's Commercial Walking) NC (Neighborhood Commercial) and the IL (Light Industrial) zoning districts.
- Residential density in the former zoning districts is 4 dwelling units with the exception of the IL district which does not allow residential density. The residential density is proposed to be increased from 8 units to 10 units.
- Resort accommodations are not allowed in any of the former zoning districts, the use is proposed to be allowed in COM-MX at a density of 35 rooms.
- Nonresidential density ranges from 3,000 square feet to 12,000 square feet in the former zoning districts; the proposed nonresidential density is proposed to be 8,000 square feet.
- Maximum impervious coverage in the former zoning districts ranges from 45% to 65%; the proposed maximum impervious coverage is 60%.
- The height limitation ranges from 35' to 45' in the former zoning districts; the proposed height limitation is 45'.

General Information about the WMU zoning district

- The WMU zoning district reflects the current boundaries of the existing WMU zoning district with the exception of some Town owned parcels that have been changed to the PR zoning district.
- Residential density remains the same.
- Resort Accommodations density is increased from 20 rooms to 35 rooms
- Maximum impervious coverage remains the same.
- The height limitation remains the same.

General Information about the SMU zoning district

- The SMU zoning district reflects the current boundaries of the existing SMU zoning district with the exception of some Town owned parcels that have been changed to the PR zoning district.
- Residential density remains the same.
- Hotels, motels and inns are no longer permitted in this district.
- Maximum impervious coverage ranges from 45% to 50%; the proposed maximum impervious coverage is 50%.
- The height limitation ranges from 35' to 45'; the proposed height limitation is 35'.