



**Town of Hilton Head Island  
Planning Commission  
LMO Committee**

**Wednesday, July 26, 2017**

**3:30 p.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 Agenda**
- 4. Approval of Minutes:** May 10, 2017
- 5. Discuss Proposed 2017 LMO Amendments – Second Set**
- 6. Adjournment**

*Please note that a quorum of Town Council may result if four or more of their members attend this meeting. A quorum of Planning Commissioners may result if five or more of their members attend this meeting.*

**TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND**  
**LMO Committee Meeting**  
**May 10, 2017 – 6:00p.m.**  
**Benjamin M. Racusin Council Chambers**

Committee Members Present: Chairman Jim Gant, Lavon Stevens, Barry Taylor

Committee Members Absent: Todd Theodore

Town Council Present: None

Town Staff Present: Teri Lewis, LMO Official

---

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman Gant called the meeting to order at 6:00p.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 agenda was approved as presented by general consent.

**4. Approval of the Minutes** – January 25, 2017, March 22, 2017, March 29, 2017

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the minutes of the January 25, March 22, and March 29, 2017 meetings. Mr. Stevens seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**5. Discuss Zoning of Bradley Circle Area**

Chairman Gant presented statements regarding a recent Planning Commission meeting that provided property owners in the Bradley Circle area to express their opinions related to the RD and RM-8 zoning districts. The Planning Commission asked the Committee to review whether or not the area should be rezoned; and further asked the Committee to consider whether or not the property should remain RD, be rezoned back to RM-8 or be rezoned to RM-12. The Committee has reviewed the differences between the three zoning districts and today will hear from the public related to the potential rezoning of the area.

Chairman Gant asked that citizens in support of rezoning the area to RM8 provide their perspective first and to identify what specific features of RD that they don't like or think needs to be changed.

Tammy Becker presented statements regarding how the area got to the existing RD zoning. She indicated back in 1999, a Ward 1 plan looked at some areas including Chaplin Park and Bradley Circle is part of Chaplin Park. Bradley Circle was zoned residential area, RM4. In 2002, Chaplin Park plan concluded Bradley Circle remain a residential area. In 2012, a Comprehensive Plan was adopted to include the 2002 Chaplin Park plan. The natural environment, aesthetics, and qualities of island character need to be preserved. In October 2014, a new LMO was adopted by the Town. She purchased her home in May 2014 and did not know about this. She presented statements regarding properties 20, 22, 24 Bradley Circle as not consistent with a residential area and island character. She wants

the area to go back to RM8, single family homes, no higher than 45'.

Keith Sledge agreed with concerns already stated. He presented statements concerning: safety, overflow parking in the street and emergency accessibility will be blocked, people parking on the small bridges in the area and near his properties off of Terra Bella Trace.

Ronda Carper agreed with concerns already stated. She added safety concerns for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Charlie Gibson agreed with concerns already stated. He added statements concerning the character of the neighborhood is not consistent with RD, and health and safety concerns. He noted that no parking is permitted on a 20' road.

Scott Goulder stated that changing the zoning law to what it is now was not fair.

Chairman Gant asked for any further public comments in support of rezoning the area to RM8 and none were received. Chairman Gant recognized that some neighbors are opposed specifically to 20, 22, and 24 Bradley Circle, but a path going forward needs to be figured out. Chairman Gant summarized public comments and concerns received to this point as follows: the history of the area, the island character of the area, height limitation, and the concern about commercial or multi-family housing in an area that has limited road infrastructure to allow traffic to safely flow through the area (traffic and safety issues).

Chairman Gant then asked that citizens in support of retaining RD zoning for this area provide their perspective.

Carl Braden voiced support for RD and RM12. He expressed consideration to RM8 supporters and their request and granting of the 45' height limitation. He wants the extra density to have the ability to create duplexes with his properties. Prior to the LMO rewrite, three rear properties adjacent to Surfwatch were already RD and he wants that to remain. He wants Robert Singleton to be able to develop his properties RD.

Robert Singleton wants RD and commercial activity to remain to develop his property as a BBQ.

Walter Nester presented the Committee with a summary of his comments from the April 5 Planning Commission meeting. He stated the Mayor's Task Force was created in 2010 to talk about a vision for the Town and out of that came a recommendation to revise the LMO as appropriate. The LMO Rewrite Committee was formed and out of its three years of work came the total rewrite and adoption of a new LMO in October 2014. That rewrite included the expansion of the RD district in the Bradley Beach area. That approval process was undertaken in accordance with applicable law and all property owners were provided appropriate notice. Afterward, the Circle to Circle Committee (CTC) studied among other things how to address existing and future traffic in the Sea Pines Circle to Coligny Circle corridor. One of the CTC recommendations was to promote other beaches in the Town. Changing the RD district as it exists today to RM-8 creates problems for those property owners who have owned that property throughout this process. He believes the Town Councils throughout this process were seeking to provide the opportunity for property

owners to develop and redevelop. He is sympathetic to safety concerns, however, parking requirements and height restrictions have been addressed. He cautioned that rezoning the area could be considered spot zoning.

Judd Carstens presented statements as a CTC member. CTC saw a demand and a need for bringing visitors and residents away from the south island beaches. The beach access at the end of Burkes Beach Road/Driessen Beach is the closest in distance to bring those people to the beach. He believes changing the zoning would be detrimental.

Terry Gibson spoke to the neighborhood beach access and questions arose to who owns it.

Chairman Gant summarized the views and concerns for this area remaining RD as follows: the increased density (over RM-8) provides opportunity for people who have invested in the property, the ability to operate a BBQ stand/restaurant, the reduced opportunity for those people who have invested based on the area being zoned as RD, the benefit for small or limited retail, and the opportunity to expand island wide beach access and proximity.

Radu Chindris spoke to the development process for 20, 22, and 24 Bradley Circle. Under RD, these homes could have been built without a variance and with more square footage. The variance allowed the homes to be separated and as a result square footage was reduced. Separate homes is in keeping with single family character. He presented statements regarding the two undeveloped lots that remain and applicable regulations would limit any multifamily developments. He expressed wanting the neighborhood to work together and to make the improvements they feel is necessary. He expressed concern for spot zoning.

Wallace Milling presented statements regarding safety concerns. He agreed with previous comments to work together on any safety improvements. He offered that safety concerns could be fixed through economic investment and raising the bar, and it would help quell such concerns.

Chairman Gant presented a summary to make sure everything was captured and covered today. Chairman Gant indicated that today's comments will be reported to the Planning Commission at its next meeting.

## **6. Update on Food Truck Pilot Program**

Mrs. Lewis provided an update on the food truck pilot program. The Town has issued an invitation for bids. It is posted on the Town's website and will be in tomorrow's newspaper. It solicits bids for four designated locations – two in Driessen Beach Park, one in Chaplin Community Park, and one at the end of Burkes Beach Road. A mandatory pre-bid meeting will be held on May 16<sup>th</sup> at 10:00am and bids are due May 26<sup>th</sup> by 1:00pm. The contract will be for the time period of June 9 through Labor Day of this year.

One member of the public expressed concern for conflicts for his company and the food truck vendors. He did not identify himself by name, but as an owner of a local vending company serving the area near the proposed food truck locations. He stated he reviewed the RFP for food trucks and made statements as to the requirements for his company being more stringent than for food trucks.

**7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:26p.m.

Submitted by: Teresa Haley, Senior Administrative Assistant

Approved:

---

Peter Kristian, Chairman

DRAFT

# PROPOSED 2017 LMO AMENDMENT LIST – 2<sup>ND</sup> SET

LMO Section & Title	Issue	Proposed Change
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>		
16-2-103.D.4 PUD District Review Standards	'Sec. 16-1-101' appears to be an incorrect reference	Amend to read correctly
16-2-103.I.4.b.iii Corridor Review	The DRB is required to receive a written notice of action from any applicable ARBs before the DRB takes final action. It is unclear whether the NOA from the ARB needs to be the final action the ARB takes.	Amend the LMO to make it clear that the Town should receive the final ARB action before the DRB takes final action.
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>		
16-3-105.B.3 Coligny Resort District	The buffers in the CR district are very specific to this district but are not listed in the CR district	Add cross references to the CR district and Chapter 5 about what the buffers are/aren't for this district
16-3-105.I.3 Mitchelville District	Increase impervious requirement in MV district (BZA)	Recommend changing to 50% - a lot of this area used to be in the WMU district in the old LMO – at that time the impervious for WMU was 50% - most of the other standards for Mitchelville mirrored the old WMU district standards
16-3-106.G.5 PD-2 Listed Master Plans	Change the PD-2 Overlay information for Tabby Village (ND)	Update the table to reflect the changes that were adopted to the Tabby Village PD-2
16-3-106.H.4.b.ii Buffers	During the LMO Rewrite the maximum driveway width for the Forest Beach overlay district was changed to from 24' to 18'. This has created many nonconformities and there seems to be no reason for the change.	Change back to 24'
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>		
16-4-102.B.7.c.iii	The word 'have' is missing after 'shall not'	Add 'have'

Bicycle Shops		
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>		
Table 16-5-102.C – Adjacent Street Setbacks Table 16-5-103.D – Adjacent Street Buffers	Requiring buffers and setbacks from an access easement that is in the middle of a commercial development does not make any sense	Require that this setback/buffer only apply to residential properties
16-5-102.D.4 – Adjacent Use Setbacks 16-5-103.E.2 – Adjacent Use Buffers	Concerns have been raised, some by Town Council, about the fact that there are no criteria that staff can use to waive the setbacks and buffers between properties. Additionally, Town Council requested that the waiver not be applicable to single-family properties	Develop criteria for buffer/setback waiver, eliminate the ability for single-family to use this waiver
16-5-103. - Buffers 16-5-107.D.10 – EV Charging Station 16-5-107.H.7 – Bicycle Parking	There have been questions about when the EV station, bike parking requirement and buffer type should kick in when a site is being expanded or altered. After discussions among staff and the Town Attorney, it was determined that the requirements should be applied if the expansion is more than 50%.	Add language to each individual section (EV Charging Stations, Bicycle Parking and Buffers) that states if they are adding 50% square footage then they have to bring buffers, EV charging station and bike parking into compliance as much as feasible. If not adding square footage, just making parking changes than at 50% just the bike parking needs to come into compliance as much as possible. If just making changes to the buffer then at 50% buffers would need to come into compliance.
16-5-108 – Site Lighting Standards 16-5-114.I.b.02.A and 16-5-114.E.1.b.ii.12 – Sign Standards	Often decorative lights are attached to trees with nails. This is harmful to trees. Lights should not be attached to trees with nails	Consider adding a prohibition against using nails to attach lights to trees
16-5-102.B.d Setbacks	There are limited standards for zero lot line subdivisions and the definition is unclear	Beef up standards and definitions for zero lot line subdivisions
Table 16-5-102.E Allowable Setback Encroachments	The table states that ‘uncovered porches, stoops, decks, patios, terraces, or walkways may extent or be located in any setback if set back from lot lines by a distance no more than the feature’s height’ The unintended consequence is that if a deck is 6” tall only a 6” setback is required.	Consider changing this to a percentage or at least establishing a minimum setback
Table 16-5-102.E Allowable Setback Encroachments	Bollards should be listed as an acceptable encroachment in a setback in Table 16-5-102.E	Consider adding bollards to the list of site furnishings allowed in a setback
16-5-105.A.e.ii Driveway Layout and Design	There have been several instances where someone has a service driveway that only serves something like a dumpster, driveways are required to be a minimum of 14’ per the LMO even though 10’ would be wide enough for this type of service driveway	Consider allowing service driveways to be 10’ wide
Table 16-5-107.D.1 Minimum Number of Parking Spaces	Golf courses can have multiple tees per hole which based on current parking standards can result in more parking spaces than necessary being required.	Under Commercial Recreation – Golf Courses, Miniature Golf Courses, or Driving Ranges, change “X per tee” to “X per hole” for Golf Courses and Miniature Golf Courses. Keep “X per tee” for Driving Ranges.
16-5-107.F.3.b Curbs and Wheel Stops	The LMO states that the bearing side of concrete wheel stops shall be “no more than 18 inches from the end of the parking space.” This language effectively allows placing the wheel stops closer to or on the end of the stall in a manner that may facilitate excessive vehicle intrusion into sidewalks, other pedestrian walkways, and physical impacts with trees or infrastructure appurtenances.	Change it to say that the offset of the bearing course would be 18 inches period
16-5-107.G Landscaping of Parking Lots	For patios adjacent to parking spaces – consider not requiring a full landscape median but a small planting bed instead (example is NYC Pizza at Shelter Cove)	Research whether or not this makes sense and if there would be any negative repercussions

16-5-107.H.8 Loading Areas	There is no flexibility for meeting loading standards particularly when it happens in a drive aisle and the buffer can't be met	Provide some flexibility
16-5-108 Site Lighting Standards	Consider adding light standards in the LMO for building lights (internal and external). Consider adding color temps for LED lights	Research whether it would be possible to create lighting standards for building lights, both internal and external. Research what would need to be changed/added to put in color temps for LED lights
16-5-108 Site Lighting Standards	Consider adding a prohibition against non-white site lighting with an exception for lighting that is near the beach and needs to be sea turtle compliant	Amend 16-5-108.C to prohibit the use of non-white lights
16-5-113 Fence and Wall Standards	It is sometimes unclear to the public where fences are allowed	Add an illustration for where fences can go
16-5-114 Sign Standards	Currently a tenant that has multiple tenant spaces in a multi-tenant building can have the same side on each of the individual tenant spaces	Consider amending the language to say that in this situation, each sign has to be different or that there can only be x number of signs
16-5-114.G Façade and Hanging Signs	The current LMO states that façade signs can only occupy 10% of the area of the façade on which they are placed. A recent review of this indicated that (1) we are not measuring for this and that (2) if we did, this number would not work	Research and determine what percentage would be appropriate or if there a better way of doing this.
16-5-114 Sign Standards	The Town has been approached about allowing rectangular banner signs along some of our main roads to accommodate large special events Banner signs	Draft language to accommodate these types of signs
<b>CHAPTER 10</b>		
	Need to review use examples and accessory uses and ensure that they are correct for each category (i.e. gyms being indoor recreation, mopeds/scooters as vehicles, what agriculture allows/conflicts)	If any conflicts are identified, make the necessary changes to correct them.
<b>APPENDIX C</b>		
Recommended Native Plants	There is some concern that there may be some plants on the list that aren't true native plants.	Review the list and make sure we think the plants on this list are natives and are acceptable plants to be planted in buffers. We should also consider developing an invasive plant list and add to the LMO (plants that should never be planted). -maybe change 'native' to acceptable or desirable