Town of Hilton Head Island
Planning Commission
LMO Rewrite Committee Meeting
February 27, 2014
8:30 a.m.
Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers

REVISED 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 –** February 5, 2014
5. **Unfinished Business**
   a. Discussion of Conditions
6. **New Business**
   a. LMO Rewrite Committee Review Process
   b. Follow-up discussion related to 2/12/14 Workshop
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 Draft

LMO REWRITE COMMITTEE MEETING

February 5, 2014 Minutes

2:00p.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:	None
Town Council Members Present:	Bill Harkins
Town Staff Present:	Teri Lewis, LMO Official Brian Hulbert, Staff Attorney 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 January 28, 2014 meeting as presented by general consent.

5) Unfinished Business

None

Mr. Gant presented statements in follow up to last week's discussion on RM-4. Following the January 28th meeting Mr. Gant stated he re-read the Ward 1 Master Plan and would like to suggest a couple of things for consideration. The committee has heard from members of the community on a couple of topics: (1) the inclusion of some properties along Port Royal Sound into the proposed Mitchelville District; and (2) on more opportunity for development in the RM-4 District.

Following last week's discussion the committee concluded that the properties along Port Royal Sound need additional consideration and study. The committee would like to request that Town Council ask the Planning Commission to take an additional look at this issue. The Committee is concerned that they may not have the knowledge to decide whether or not they should be rezoned.

Regarding the issue of bonus density, the Ward 1 Master Plan and the current LMO both define the land use as intended to accommodate and maintain a large area of relatively low density residential development. This is why it is zoned 4 units per acre.

On the other hand, there is an interest in incremental development there so perhaps we should consider re-establishing the bonus density in RM-4 that was identified in the Ward 1 Master Plan (i.e. 2 additional units per acre on 3 acres, and up to 4 additional units on 5 acres.) This would give us somewhat of a balance of opportunity and yet retain it as predominately a low density residential area.

Mr. Ames stated that he does not feel that we have enough information at this time on RM-4 to say if this is a good concept or not. The Planning Commission might want to look at that. The Committee is sympathetic to the community's concerns on RM-4; however, the Committee does not feel that they are in a position to make a recommendation on this concept today. The Committee discussed possible steps moving forward.

RM-4 covers a lot of land. Allowing 8 units per acre everywhere does not make a lot of sense. It should be allowed on larger properties. Density in the right place is a win-win for the community. The Planning Commission should have an opportunity to study this to formulate a recommendation to Town Council. The Committee agreed that the concept needs to be studied further. Charles Cousins presented statements regarding the Planning Commission's review of the Land Management Ordinance. Mr. Gant stated that this issue is outside of the LMO. The Planning Commission should decide whether or not to hold up the LMO rewrite process.

Councilman Bill Harkins stated that this subject should probably be separate from the re-write of the LMO. Town Council would like to move the re-write project along and it should not be held up.

Mr. Chet Williams stated that this issue should not be separate from the re-write of the LMO. Mr. Williams stated his concern with the notification process when rezoning property down the road.

Chairman Crews presented statements regarding the charge given by Town Council to the LMO Rewrite Committee. The Committee stated that the expectation on the part of Town Council is to finish the re-write of the LMO. RM-4 has some unresolved issues brought to the Committee by the community. It will be up to Town Council to decide the next steps regarding what RM-4 should be in the future.

Density across all parcels in RM-4 is a very large issue - the issue pertains to a large geographic area and is too important for this Committee to make a decision on this today. Mr. Campbell stated his concern with the Committee's reluctance to make a recommendation on issues that concern Ward 1. Mr. Campbell stated his concern with Ward 1 parcels being treated differently than non-Ward 1 parcels.

n Mr. Campbell, Mr. Chet Williams, and the committee discussed several Ward 1 issues. Citizen, Mr. Perry White presented statements regarding the Committee's need to be proactive in their recommendation to the Planning Commission concerning RM-4 and Ward 1.

The Committee stated their concern that they do not know the impact of 8-units per acre for every single RM-4 parcel on the island. It is a very large issue and needs to go to the Planning Commission and to Town Council.

The Committee asked if Town Council would want the Committee to continue with this work. Does Town Council want the Committee to study RM-4 further? The Committee discussed higher density and access. The Committee needs to decide what kind of information they need. What will the data be? What about the environmental impact? Traffic patterns and pollution issues need to be considered - this is more qualitative and is difficult to measure.

Mr. Perry White presented comments regarding the existing and long-term problems in Ward 1. Mr. White presented statements regarding the current installation of sewer lines in Ward 1.

Councilman Harkins recommended that the question be framed and sent to Town Council and the Mayor. The Town Council will get back to the Committee with their response.

The Committee stated that the following two points need to be clarified: (1) the density issue (currently RM-4) by Port Royal Sound around Mitchelville; and (2) the greater RM-4 area is an issue. Maybe there will be places on the island that will not remain RM-4. There are legitimate points concerning Ward 1 that need additional attention, but those decisions cannot be reached today by this Committee. This will take additional time beyond the timeline given to the Committee by Town Council.

Mr. Campbell and Mr. Perry White reiterated their concerns with the Committee's reluctance to make a recommendation on RM-4 to the Planning Commission and Town Council. More action is needed by the Committee with regard to a recommendation on Ward 1 and RM-4.

Following final discussion, Chairman Crews and the Board decided upon the following next steps: (1) a letter or memo will be sent to the Mayor; and (2) a work plan needs to be formulated by the Committee with regard to next steps. Following final comments on the issue, the committee and staff moved to a review of today's New Business.

1. New Business

a. <u>Discussion regarding the CC (Community Commercial) and LC (Light Commercial) zoning districts related to density</u>

Ms. Lewis presented a brief review of the Committee's previous discussion on these zoning districts as related to density. The Committee had discussed making the CC zoning district where the 'smaller big box developments' are encouraged. Staff and the Committee discussed trying to accomplish this goal by making the density higher in the CC district or limiting the size of certain stores in the LC district.

Several members of the Committee stated that the greatest flexibility on the island should be on Mathews Drive (Hwy. 278 intersection area.) Secondly, if we are trying to encourage the Commercial District in certain areas, then the LC which is strung along the highway should not have the incentive to develop as intensely. The staff and the Committee discussed the creation of non-conformities if you drop the LC zoning district down because it is made up of a variety of zoning districts. We should not change density if it creates non-conformities.

Chester Williams, Esq., and the Committee discussed imposing a maximum square footage on buildings in the LC district as a way to encourage big box development in the CC district.

The Planning Commission has previously stated their concern with Hwy. 278 towards Sea Pines Circle as an area where one would be able to compile a land bank and create a big box. This is not something that the Committee wants and certainly is not something that the Planning Commission wants.

Chet Williams presented statements regarding the issue of combining parcels.

The Committee discussed square footage requirements. Chairman Crews requested that Ms. Lewis identify some well known properties for reference purposes. The new Kroger building is 87,000 square feet. The Committee discussed the square footage of Coligny (Piggly Wiggly – 13,000 square feet.) Parking requirements were discussed briefly. 12,000 sq. feet is probably okay in the CC district. What if we add more land to the CC district and place more limitations in the LC district. The Committee and staff discussed keeping 8,000 square feet in the LC district and

increasing the allowable square footage in the CC district. How can we incentivize the CC district? The Committee discussed the limit on the size of a shopping center (SMU and MMU zoning districts). There is no limit on the size of a shopping center in the CC and LC zoning districts. The Committee discussed square footage in relationship to buffer requirements.

The Committee discussed allowing 10,000 square feet per acre in the CC district. The staff and the Committee discussed the location of Sam's Club. How do we encourage redevelopment in the CC district? How concerned should we be with limiting non-conformities? How can we be more flexible when dealing with non-conformities?

Following final discussion, the Committee asked for staff to provide additional information related to the size of existing buildings in the LC district. Staff will help with building size limitation and separation issues for the LC district. A 15-ft. separation between buildings on the same site is a better pedestrian experience. Staff will test some parcels to check for non-conformities. Due to time constraints, the Committee was unable to complete the review of the following two agenda items.

b. Discussion of Conditions

c. Discussion related to Planning Commission zoning district workshop

7) ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.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: February 17, 2014
SUBJECT: Conditions

Over the past year, the LMO Rewrite Committee has discussed uses and associated conditions. The committee voted to eliminate some conditions and to add others. Draft Chapter 4 (specifically pages 4-7 – 4-20) contains the recommended conditions for various uses. While a variety of smaller changes need to be made to this section (i.e. eliminate the conditions related to Interval Occupancy, using consistent language) staff needs specific direction from the committee related to the following conditions:

Grocery Stores
Grocery stores located in the CC District shall have a gross floor area no greater than 50,000 square feet.
[Staff recommends that there be no limitation on the square footage of grocery stores in the CC district.]

Shopping Centers
A shopping center shall comply with the following conditions:
01. The site shall have direct access to a major or minor arterial, in accordance with Sec. 16-5-105.B, Street Hierarchy.
02. Shopping centers located in the SMU and MMU Districts shall not have a maximum gross floor area of more than 100,000 square feet.
[The Committee had asked the consultant to recommend a maximum gross floor area for shopping centers in the Stoney and Marsh Front districts; staff believes this number is higher than the Committee intended.]

Other Commercial Services
Other commercial services shall comply with the following conditions:
01. Other commercial services located in the RM-4 District shall have a gross floor area no greater than 1,200 square feet.
02. Other commercial services located in the CC District shall have a gross floor area no greater than 50,000 square feet.
[Staff recommends that there be no limitation on the square footage of other commercial services in the CC district.]

Gas Sales
A gas station shall comply with the following conditions:
01. The site shall have direct access to a minor arterial, in accordance with Sec. 16-5-105.B, Street Hierarchy. No direct access to a major arterial shall be permitted.

02. The site shall be located at the intersection of at least two streets, one of which shall be a minor arterial.
03. If the site is within 500 feet of an intersection of any street with a major arterial, there shall be a traffic signal at that intersection. The distance shall be measured using the shortest distance a vehicle could travel from the site to the intersection.
04. No more than two uses offering gas sales shall be located at the intersection of a major arterial with a minor arterial. The two uses shall be located on opposite sides of the major arterial.
05. No more than 16 pumps (defined as a fueling area for an individual vehicle) shall be permitted at a gas sales establishment.
06. No signs shall be located on any canopy over the pumps.
[The Committee has expressed some concern with not allowing any access to a major arterial.]