



Town of Hilton Head Island  
Planning Commission  
LMO Rewrite Committee Meeting  
July 17, 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 – July 11, 2013 Meeting**
- 5. Unfinished Business**
  - a. Summary of LMO Rewrite Committee recommended changes to the Adjacent Use and Adjacent Street Setback and Buffers Section of the Draft LMO
- 6. New Business**
- 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

July 11, 2013 Minutes  
8:30a.m. – Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers

Committee Members Present: Chairman Tom Crews, Vice Chairman Gail Quick,  
David Bachelder, Chris Darnell, Jim Gant, Walter Nester,  
Kim Likins, *Ex-Officio*

Committee Members Absent: David Ames and Charles Cousins, *Ex-Officio*

Planning Commissioners Present: None

Town Staff Present: Teri Lewis, LMO Official  
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 June 27, 2013 meeting minutes as presented by general consent.

Chairman Crews welcomed the public and asked Ms. Teri Lewis to make her presentation on behalf of staff.

5) **NEW BUSINESS**

**Adjacent Street and Adjacent Use Setbacks and Buffers**

Ms. Teri Lewis made the staff's presentation on Adjacent Street and Adjacent Use Setbacks and Buffers. Ms. Lewis stated that the committee's discussion on setbacks goes hand in hand with their discussion of buffers. It's difficult to talk about one without considering the impact to the other.

Ms. Lewis presented statements regarding the consultant's views on setbacks and buffers. Ms. Lewis also presented statements regarding the committee's concerns related to setbacks and buffers. The staff is looking for input from the committee based on today's discussion.

Ms. Lewis presented an overhead review of two site plans showing the location of setbacks and buffers on existing sites. Ms. Lewis also showed aerials of these same two sites and the surrounding areas. Ms. Lewis stated that the numbers stay the same in adjacent use setbacks, and the setback section remains largely the same. The staff believes that this is in conflict with what the committee requested. Ms. Lewis stated that flexibility in setbacks is provided in the following districts: (1) Coligny: use and street setbacks only apply to properties on the perimeter of the district; (2) SMU (Stoney Mixed Use) street setbacks (other than major and minor arterials) can be reduced with conditions; (3) IL (Light Industrial) street setbacks (other than major and minor arterials) can be reduced with conditions.

Ms. Lewis stated that the buffer section provides different buffer types for different buffer areas. It also provides the developer with two different types of buffer options to choose from. Flexibility is also provided for the developer to submit an alternative buffer plan.

The staff thinks the flexibility provided begins to go in the direction that the committee wants but questions whether the provided format is too difficult to follow.

The staff would like to receive input from the committee on setbacks and buffers, particularly those that adjoin similar property.

Mr. Nester stated that the buffers are the concern (not the setbacks). The committee felt that the proposed setbacks were appropriate because we do not want building right up against property lines. The committee recommended that rather than zero buffer between properties, a 6' buffer should be provided, this way parking is not right up against the property line.

Mr. Nester presented comments with regard to the need for interconnectivity. Incentives would be appropriate, but you cannot force it. Pedestrian access walkway across a buffer can be done today. Connectivity includes everything that keeps people off the main roads.

The committee stated the need to encourage incentives. Business owners would want this shared use. The committee discussed the need for increased graphics. Mr. Darnell presented statements regarding overstory and understory landscaping. Ms. Lewis presented a definition of overstory from the LMO.

Ms. Lewis presented an overhead review of the Coligny area. The committee discussed what is being proposed. The committee stated that they are happy with the boundary lines of the district. The committee discussed minor arterials and pedestrian walking areas. They presented brief comments regarding performance standards and the need for flexibility to respond to design potential.

Mr. Darnell and the other committee members stated that they are looking for additional graphics. The committee presented comments regarding the perimeter of the South Forest Beach area including parking. The committee presented statements in concern of the height relative to the edge of the property along the street. The committee presented comments with regard to stair stepping the height along the street frontage and at the edge of the district and pedestrian scale. Perhaps the sliding scale of where that height can occur relative to that property line depends on the height. Where is the guarantee? Ms. Lewis stated that this was the consultant's response to the committee. They did it because they were asked to.

The committee discussed pedestrian scale and the buffer related to the height of the building. Consider linking the buffer to the height of the building. Ms. Lewis discussed the Old Adventure Inn site (which will be redeveloped.) The committee wants to not have the exception along the arterial roadways.

The committee stated that South Forest Beach is a good candidate for design opportunity. The committee presented comments regarding the Coligny redevelopment plan. Ms. Lewis stated that the staff will bring graphics to the next committee meeting. The committee asked about writing the code to reflect what is being done.

Ms. Lewis reviewed page 5-7 of the staff's handout with regard to providing some flexibility in the Stoney Mixed Use District – along other roads besides major and minor arterials. The committee provided comments regarding modifications in the Stoney Mixed Use (SMU) district.

Chet Williams, Esq., presented comments with regard to setback and buffer requirements.

The staff and the committee discussed the major arterial – 50-ft. and minor arterial – 40-feet. The committee stated that they do not want to change any of the buffers or setbacks along Highway 278 in the Stoney District.

Ms. Lewis provided comments regarding the existing setback along Squire Pope Road (40 ft.) This can be reduced by up to 30% with conditions. The staff and the committee stated the need to allow more flexibility in the Chaplin area. The staff and the committee discussed the proposed buffer along minor arterials (15 – 20-ft.)

The consultant needs to be cautious when drafting language that is too subjective.

Ms. Lewis presented comments on page 5 – 10 the setbacks encroachment table. The committee stated that they like the tabular format. It's an improvement over the existing format.

At the completion of the discussion, Ms. Lewis stated that staff will capture the specific bullet points discussed today, and they will bring them back to the committee for review at the next meeting prior to forwarding the recommended changes to the consultant. The staff will also bring graphics to the next meeting. Ms. Lewis requested that the members bring their copies of the staff's handout on Adjacent Street and Adjacent Use Setbacks and Buffers to the next meeting.

Chairman Crews then distributed a handout to the committee that contained a schedule of upcoming meeting dates and associated topics. The next committee meeting will be held on July 17<sup>th</sup>; the committee will complete their discussion of Adjacent Use and Street Setbacks and Buffers.

At the July 25<sup>th</sup> meeting the committee will discuss Trees. There will be no meeting on August 1<sup>st</sup> because Chairman Crews is presenting an update on the LMO Rewrite process to the Greater Island Committee that morning. The committee will meet on August 8<sup>th</sup> - the topic will be Wetland Buffers. The committee will discuss Nonconformities on August 14<sup>th</sup>. On August 22<sup>nd</sup> the committee will review the Corridor Overlay District (COR), Stormwater – a brief review of what has changed along with Definitions.

On August 29<sup>th</sup> the topic will be Heirs Property – subdivision and access/infrastructure issues. The consultant, Clarion & Associates, will be present at the August 29<sup>th</sup> meeting. Staff stated

that they are working with Clarion on the exact date that they will be here; there is the potential that the Heirs property discussion may be held on August 14<sup>th</sup> or August 22<sup>nd</sup> instead of August 29<sup>th</sup>. The plan is to have a meeting at 8:30 am and then an evening meeting at 6 pm when the consultants are in town.

**7) ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20a.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:** July 12, 2013  
**SUBJECT:** Summary of recommended changes to the Adjacent Use and Adjacent Street Setback and Buffer sections of the draft LMO

---

At the meeting on July 11<sup>th</sup> the committee recommended some changes to the proposed Adjacent Use and Adjacent Street Setback and Buffer sections. The changes are listed below:

- Require a 6' adjacent use buffer between similar uses (currently a buffer is not proposed between similar uses)
- Add back in language that provides for the setback and buffer to be eliminated between properties that function together
- Ask the consultant if they can develop a list of incentives that can be used to encourage interconnectivity (pedestrian, vehicular or both) between properties that have similar uses
- Notes need to be provided that specify what A-E refer to in Tables 16-5-103.G and 16-5-103.H
- Ensure that the definitions for 'Overstory', 'Understory' and 'Evergreen Shrub' are easy to understand and make sense in the context that they are used
- The setbacks and buffers need to be 'tested' on some parcels to ensure that they work in conjunction with one another and that the desired flexibility is being achieved
- Create different setbacks and buffers for Coligny – these should be less stringent than other districts but should not be a zero buffer and setback
  - The setbacks and buffers should apply to major and minor arterials in the district but not to other streets
  - Consider how buildings can get closer to the street without creating a 'wall' effect
- Add back in the specific language regarding which portions of PD-1s are exempt from the setback and buffer standards
- Look into inconsistencies between requirements for open space in PD-1s versus PD-2s
- Section 16-5-103.D.2: eliminate 'minor arterials', add 'requested' in front of 'permitted', make the language less subjective
- Section 16-5-103.O: make the language less subjective

At the meeting on July 17<sup>th</sup> the committee will review the above suggestions prior to sending them to the consultant and review graphics related to the Coligny district.