



Town of Hilton Head Island  
Planning Commission  
LMO Rewrite Committee Meeting

March 21, 2014

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 – March 13, 2014**
- 5. Unfinished Business**
- 6. New Business**
  - a. Chapter 6 [Natural Resources] Advisory Committee Report
- 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

March 13, 2014 Minutes  
8:30a.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 Kim Likins, *Ex-Officio*

Committee Members Absent: Charles Cousins

Planning Commissioners Present: None

Town Council Members Present: Bill Harkins

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 minutes of the February 27, 2014 meeting as presented by general consent. The committee also **approved** the minutes of the March 6, 2014 meeting as presented by general consent.
- 4) **Unfinished Business**  
None
- 5) **New Business**

**Advisory Committee Report – Chapter 5**

Mr. Jim Gant stated that the Chapter 5 - LMO Design Standards Prep Team held a public meeting on March 10, 2014. Team members are: Tom Crews, Chris Darnell and Jim Gant. Ms. Teri Lewis and Curtis Coltrane, Town Attorney, also attended the meeting. Chairman Crews distributed copies of the Advisory Committee Report for Chapter 5.

Town Council's Charter to the LMO Rewrite Committee was to develop specific design standards for selected zoning districts, to review non district specific design and natural resource standards and eliminate outdated requirements and create flexibility where appropriate.

The components of Design Standards are: Adjacent Setbacks and Buffers, Open Space, Mobility, Street and Pathway, Traffic Analysis, Parking and Loading, Site Lighting, Storm Water Management and Erosion, Utility, Fire Protection Water Supply, Flood Zone, Fence and Wall, Sign, Single Family Residential Compatibility, Subdivision and Impact Fees.

Chairman Crews and Ms. Lewis discussed a couple of issues concerning setbacks and buffers. Chester C. Williams, Ms. Lewis and Chairman Crews discussed the issue of restricted access and gated communities (as related to compliance with site specific codes.) Ms. Lewis will check with Mr. Charles Cousins for input on this issue. An update will be provided to the committee at next week's meeting.

Chairman Crews stated that a lot of the existing LMO will remain unchanged. The new LMO will contain improved page notes with more diagrams, tables and pictures which will be a big help to the public. The creation of multiple buffer types and options will create additional flexibility. Chairman Crews requested that Mr. Chris Darnell provide comments on this section of the report.

Mr. Darnell stated that there are a variety of buffer options. Not as much planting is required on wider buffers. The outcome, however, is the same for the buffer. There are five different buffer types for increased flexibility depending upon the road or use that you are next to. This should appeal to a lot of developers. Mr. Darnell presented comments regarding the committee's discussion to possibly create a 6' green space between head to head parking lots on adjacent properties.

Chairman Crews presented comments regarding specific design standards for selected zoning districts.

Chester C. Williams presented public comments regarding the previous discussion on parking lots (head to head parking). Consider providing an incentive for the adjoining property owners to make that cross connection between parking lots. Mr. Ames recommended that the committee pass some of these recommendations on to the Planning Commission in a timely fashion. The committee agreed that a 'bucket list' of recommendations might be a good idea to pass on to the Planning Commission. Mr. Gant stated that he will keep a list of Open Issues of items. Vice Chairman Quick cautioned the committee not to send too many unresolved issues on to the Planning Commission.

Chester Williams stated that there will probably be a series of revisions to this in future years.

Ms. Lewis asked the committee if they are ready to move on to the Open Issues; the committee stated that they are ready. Chairman Crews presented comments regarding the issues that were identified and no additional action is needed. Mr. Ames suggested that these items be approved as presented.

The next Open Issue is the beginning height for calculation of adjacent setback angle penalizes properties that are above flood level. Starting the calculation for the adjacent setback angle at the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) is beneficial to properties where predevelopment grade is below BFE, but detrimental for sites above BFE. The advisory committee recommends setback angle begin at 20-ft. above BFE or predevelopment grade whichever is higher. The committee agreed with forwarding this recommendation on to the Planning Commission.

The next open issue is statements providing for decisions "at the discretion of the Administrator" are not clear and open to much debate without specific standards. The advisory committee recommended removing all references to "at the discretion of the Administrator" unless specific standards are included in the ordinance and all references to Administrative Manual. Ms. Lewis stated that the use

of the Administrative Manual is not legal in South Carolina. The committee agreed with forwarding this recommendation on to the Planning Commission.

The next open issue is the combination of setbacks and buffers in the same sections is confusing. The advisory committee recommends that we separate descriptions into two distinct sections in Chapter 5. The committee agreed with forwarding this recommendation on to the Planning Commission.

Buffer planting options would appear to allow bunching of plantings on one end of a buffer instead of along each 100-foot length. The advisory committee recommends changing the text to read “**every 100-feet** in place of per 100-feet. This will make the language more clear. Also, we should spell out how to calculate credit for existing vegetation. Chester C. Williams presented public statements on this issue. The committee agreed with forwarding this recommendation on to the Planning Commission.

The committee moved on to the next open issue. The new LMO lacks an integrated approach to street standards. The advisory committee recommends adding language to encourage but not require the use of Complete Streets design principles in Section 5-104. Chairman Crews presented statements regarding Complete Streets. Chester C. Williams stated that perhaps the Design Review Board should consider incorporating these design standards into their standards. Vice Chairman Quick stated that this is a good idea. The committee agreed with moving this issue forward to the Planning Commission as presented.

The committee moved on to the next open issue. There is nothing that allows a tradeoff between parking spaces and bike parking. The advisory committee recommends adding language allowing trade-off of automobile parking spaces for bicycle parking *with qualifiers*. Ms. Ames presented comments regarding the committee’s efforts to wrestle with this issue. Is the qualifier 3 parking spaces or is it 10 parking spaces? The committee recommended that the Urban Designer review the issue along with the head to head parking issue. With this additional information, perhaps the committee can make a recommendation to the Planning Commission next week. Ms. Lewis agreed with this recommendation.

The committee then moved on to the next open issue. The committee’s intent was to allow slightly more lighting in pedestrian areas, e.g. Coligny, Resort District, Sea Pines Circle and Waterfront Mixed Use. Ms. Lewis presented information regarding the consultant’s recommendations for separate lighting standards for separate districts. Ms. Lewis and Ms. Likins discussed the Coligny district as one of the districts identified for increased lighting standards for increased pedestrian safety. Mr. Darnell presented statements in clarification of lighting standards (minimum and average standards.) Turtle nesting must be considered in lighting design requirements. Chester C. Williams presented comments regarding the town’s authority to require that all non-conforming site plans be brought up to correct standards. The committee agreed to move this item on to the Planning Commission as presented.

The committee then moved to the next open issue. The advisory committee recommends the additional study of the Single-Family Compatibility standards (as described on page 5-85); they may create many large new non-conformities, e.g. Marriott Surfwatch, Grand Ocean, etc. It works at cross purposes to development by allowing a single property owner within 250-ft. to dictate the requirements, other effects are unknown.

The advisory committee recommends: (1) remove this section from the LMO; (2) ensure that proposed buffer standards provide protection for single family homes. The committee discussed the transition issue from a single-family district to a resort development district. Huge non-conformities could result from this action. Mr. Gant presented comments on this issue as related to the creation of

Initiative Areas (e.g. WMU transition zone - single family housing.) What does the transition look like? What about buffer standards? Mr. Darnell presented comments regarding the need to protect single-family property owners. The committee agreed with this concern. The committee discussed buffer standards in RM-4. The committee discussed buffer standards versus height. The committee stated that they would like to see some existing examples. The consultant needs to provide input on this issue. The committee may need to provide additional direction to the consultant. The staff and the committee discussed the buffer on RM-4 property and on RM-8 property. Ms. Lewis stated that it is difficult to just rely on buffer standards for protection purposes.

The committee discussed the commercial impact on single family residential. The issue is very complex. Some measurements of a couple of existing properties (e.g. Surfwatch) would be helpful regarding buffers. Ms. Lewis agreed on behalf of staff. Measurements will include height and buffers. Make sure that the buffers and setbacks are appropriate – make sure that there is enough green space. Mr. Nester recommends that the committee try not to impose building standards – just look at the buffers. The committee decided to put this issue on the agenda in two weeks (March 27<sup>th</sup>). At this meeting the committee will also address the issues regarding head to head parking lots and bike parking trade-offs. In the meantime, the staff will look at examples on the island and other communities. Mr. Gant and the committee discussed the closure process (score card) for upcoming issues and meetings.

Ms. Lewis stated that the next committee meeting will be on Friday, March 21, 2014 at 8:30a.m. The next sub-committee meeting will be on Tuesday, March 18<sup>th</sup> at 3:30p.m in Conference Room # 4. The sub-committee will discuss Chapter 6 at this meeting.

Vice Chairman Gail Quick recommended that the committee's prep-team concept be used for presentation to the Planning Commission. Prep-team members should plan to attend the Planning Commission meetings as we go along. LMO Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are the most important.

The sub-committees should plan to put together a presentation to the Planning Commission on each one of these chapters. It would be helpful to have the prep-team sit down with a member or two of the Planning Commission so that these members of the Planning Commission are more conversant with what is happening. The committee agreed that this is a good approach – it may also be a good approach for the presentation to Town Council. Mr. Gant stated that he will work with the committee (pre-team meetings with a member or two of the Planning Commission) to stay on track.

Following final comments, the meeting was adjourned.

## 7) **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00a.m.

Submitted by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathleen Carlin  
Administrative Assistant

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Crews  
Chairman