



**The Town of Hilton Head Island  
Regular Public Facilities Committee  
Meeting**

**Monday, January 22, 2018**

**9:00 a.m.**

**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. **Committee Business**
  - Approval of Minutes:
    - December 19, 2017
4. **Unfinished Business**
5. **New Business**
  - Request from Community Foundation of the Lowcountry regarding future sites for Public Art.
6. **Adjournment**

**Please note that a quorum of Town Council may result if four (4) or more of Town Council members attend this meeting.**

# TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Date: December 19, 2017

Time: 9:00 A.M.

Members Present: Marc Grant, David Ames, Tom Lennox

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Scott Liggett, Charles Cousins, Jeff Buckalew, James Cook, Shawn Colin, Jennifer Ray, Marcy Benson, Jayme Lopko

Others Present: Bill Harkins, *Councilman*, Chet Williams, Esquire, Alex Brown, Mel Campbell

Media Present: None

---

**1. Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

**2. FOIA 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. Committee Business:**

**Approval of Minutes:**

- November 27, 2017

Councilman Ames moved to approve the Minutes of November 27, 2017. Councilman Lennox seconded. The Minutes were unanimously approved. Chairman Grant abstained as he was absent from the Meeting.

**4. Unfinished Business**

- **Recommendation of Policies to Guide the Private Unpaved Road Acquisition and Paving Program**

Scott Liggett stated before them are the five policy statements (listed below) that have come forward at all of the previous Committee meetings during the discussion of this topic, to include a short discussion that also occurred at the Town Council Workshop.

1. To qualify for this program, the road must serve more than five dwellings/address points.
2. Property owners must express interest in public road right of way assemblage (100% willing participation.)
3. Land for the public road right of way must be donated to the Town.
4. Condemn land only as necessary due to unclear title issues (i.e., heirs' property.)
5. Community volunteers may assist staff with facilitating right of way donations.

It is not my intent here to re-brief and re-explain all of these policy items. If there are questions that you have regarding these, I am happy with staff support to try and address

those. I do have a couple of remarks in an attempt to clarify or provide some additional comments about each of these that I am happy to address if it pleases the Committee.

With respect to all five of these, I think there is a degree of mutual exclusivity associated with them. To this point staff sees them all kind of working in concert with this larger plan. If for whatever reason the Committee or Council itself has issue with one or more of them, I think they can be extracted from the program. There could be financial or time implications. The way we presented this, there is kind of an a la carte component to that if that is what the Committee or Council envisions.

With respect to the first policy statement that is put forward there, while it is staff's intent that we would start with a known list of roads, what I would suggest that Council could or should do is revisit that list no less frequently than annually – perhaps timed with the budget to see what roads may need to be removed from the list if there is some sort of lack of community support, perhaps those roads can come off the list. If we have a level of development that causes the roads to rise to the level that they may qualify, I think Council has an opportunity to add roads to the list. I don't view the list as static. In final terms, the list of roads that we ultimately pave may differ a little bit from the list of roads that we start with here, hopefully soon.

With respect to this expression of commitment by the property owners to participate in the program, i.e., donate land, I would suggest that some boiler plate document should be brought forth, created by the Town – presumably internally by our Legal Department, or through the guidance of legal advice to Council through Gregg Alford's office. Keep in mind the intent from my perspective is to be similarly binding on both parties that if the landowner donates, the Town will pave. We don't want to get in a lurch where we don't commit to doing what we said we would do, but similarly the property owners have to realize there is a commitment that they need to make.

Item #4 would not be carried out by staff as a blanket issuance or order of condemnation. I would suggest to you should we find ourselves in a need to condemn property that those parcels will be brought specifically back to Council like we ordinarily do seeking guidance to go ahead. I don't want you or the community to interpret that as this blanket statement of condemnation. I don't expect that we would execute it in that fashion.

Item #5 – I think there is a task here for the legal advisors of the Town to identify and craft a statement of roles and responsibilities. How these volunteers may be authorized or limited in the representations they may make on behalf of the Town. That needs to be codified. In addition to that, the commentary as to how these individuals may be selected. If left to our own devices at the staff level, I would suggest that we would reach out to the POAs through the liaisons that we have within our Community Development Department, although there may also be some political workings that have gone on or need to go on where we specifically reach in to the community and identify folks. If there is some guidance that the Committee or ultimately Council has regarding how those individuals would be selected, I would be happy to receive that advice.

Having said all of that, I continue to recommend that the Town advance the neighborhood meetings that we have talked about regarding the three roads that are already in the queue, Alfred, Aiken and Cobia. If there is support at the Committee level, I would request that you make that recommendation to Council that as we put in place the team of volunteers

that we put in place the statement for the property owners to consider that we go ahead and attempt to have these community meetings as soon after the 1<sup>st</sup> of the year staff is able to coordinate them with the respective POAs. Let's get out and revisit those three roads specifically and then the balance of the roads with presumably those volunteers can follow suit.

Chairman Grant mentioned the five dwellings – we talked about it at the Town Council Workshop of possibly reducing it to four or three. Why wouldn't that be good? Mr. Liggett answered we landed at that number as a result of the allowance that is already made in the LMO for small subdivisions. We have already determined that the five or fewer dwellings can come forward, land can be subdivided, homes constructed without the provision of the infrastructure that we would otherwise think as necessary. There is already a line of demarcation that we were trying to be mindful of when that was put forth. If we suggested that something fewer than five should give rise to the need of roadway infrastructure that would seem inconsistent of what the LMO already speaks to. Chairman Grant said he is thinking that the Gullah Task Force is looking at the LMO. Will the LMO adjust to that? Would that meet the standards in the future? Mr. Liggett said he thinks the two ought to be consistent with whatever they are. If there is a movement up or down, I would hate to be in a position where we either on one hand authorize work to occur without the need of infrastructure, but on the other hand we have a program that suggests paving of roads is a requirement. Councilman Grant said what if we have four or three and the road is not long, but the economics of the people who live on that road is really dire and the road is in bad shape. Should the Town get in the position to override this and say we really need to address this road or bring it to Town Council's attention and say we need to do something? Mr. Liggett said Council always has the authority to step in and provide guidance if you are inclined. The concern I would have over fewer and fewer address points being included as qualifying road is at what point do we have a private driveway vs. a road that surveying a number of residents. Regardless of that, roads regardless of their length that serve more people are always going to be ranked higher than smaller roads that serve less I would suggest. I think there is a natural order of things that we can do the most good – those roads will out compete the other roads that serve fewer. Having said that, if Council wants to for whatever special circumstance lend that consideration, I would see at the staff level sinking up with whatever the LMO speaks to.

Councilman Lennox asked about #4 as to what condemnation does to the title. Mr. Liggett said we aren't changing the fact that the Town desires to acquire the land. There would be a change in the fee, the land would move from the clouded title issue to a known issue for the right of way, but it doesn't clear the title on the balance of the property.

Councilman Ames asked if there has been a time when the Town, Fire Department or Sherriff has come to the Town and said this road is impassable and we have to get it paved in a small subdivision. Is the impetus from the Town ever an issue? Mr. Liggett responded it has never risen to the level of emergency response concern that caused us to pave the road. We have in the past because of conditions worked with Beaufort County and got them to maintain or address pot holes or rutted roads but not that I am aware of to the level of paving.

Chairman Grant asked if there were any comments from the audience. Mr. Alex Brown stated most of his questions would be directed at Scott Liggett. Mr. Brown stated he heard there is a plan being developed to have community meetings to discuss the paving of the

roads. I am just curious as to what those meetings are going to look like, the information that is going to be disbursed and the end game at those public meetings. My other question is in terms of the drainage not just on the dirt roads that will soon be paved, but also in the area. How is that going to be looked at comprehensively in the communities we are speaking of? Mr. Liggett said in respect to the three roads I had mentioned earlier, and the community meetings we have talked about, we have completed survey work along each of those roads. What I would expect to be a key part of the discussion of those meetings is sharing the proposed right of way acquisition plats such that the impacted and benefited property owners can have a sense of the limits of our work, the road and the extent that would actually be paved, along with the land that we need in order to make that work happen. We are able to quantify that based on property ownership as we understand it so folks could understand and know that we need 437 square feet from this property and this location that would let the projects advance. That is one of the key points of these public meetings – to share what our intent is with respect to the improvements that we would like to make and how the land that may not be included in the right of way now would have to be assembled to facilitate that.

With respect to the roadway drainage, clearly we will address any of the demands that the roadway itself and its paving brings on the community as well as making opportunities for the adjacent properties to drain into those facilities. One of the shortcomings that we will always have with respect to these roads are going onto private property to make improvements that would actually shed the water or bring it to the rights of way. The Town's project would facilitate property owners directing their storm water to the road right of way and then we would identify outfalls as may be necessary to convey that to an ultimate discharge point if we don't have one available now. There may be some drainage demands, distant or outside the right of way that we would have to identify and that is largely going to be road by road. Councilman Ames asked if it is a valid assumption that most of these roads will have road side ditches. Mr. Liggett said I would suggest that our typical section would be a normally crowned road – raised in the center and shedding water to roadside ditches. It becomes far more difficult and costly for the Town to build inverted crown roads where the drainage goes to the center of the road and then we have a closed or piped system on the shoulder.

Mr. Brown said he understood there would be a cost difference between the crown road and a ditch road – my question is do the two roads differ in the amount of footage that you need? Mr. Liggett said no, I would suggest that the acquisition on the part of the Town should strive to acquire 50' minimum road right of way for anything that would become a public road.

Mr. Brown asked what the end game of the public meetings would be - would there be an opportunity for them to potentially revise some of the standards to meet the areas. What I mean is a 50' right of way might work in some of these areas and maybe not in others. What we call a dirt road today may be in the wrong place. Those type of situations are going to come up when we have those public meetings. I am curious to know if the attitude that we gather information, go back, regroup, reform and then present again or is the attitude have a public meeting, inform and if we don't get a majority yes, then we walk away. Not sure if that is a question for Scott, but for Town Council. Councilman Lennox asked what Mr. Brown would recommend and he said the latter and have continued dialogue in terms of how we are going to get there. Mr. Grant is right in terms of the Gullah Geechee Task Force playing a part in this. There has already been discussion about

possibly changing some of the unit criteria that is in the LMO. We just haven't gotten to that point yet. I think there needs to be a two way conversation because if you push it too hard you may have some resistance from those in the community and we definitely do not want that. We are trying to develop something that would be better for everyone in the community.

Mr. Mel Campbell said we are still on the same page that we were on in 1960. Basically we are doing private developments and the Town is developing these private developments without adequate comprehensive view of what is needed in terms of total transportation. If every little mini entity does their own subdivision or the Town does their own little road, how does the interconnectivity work with that? What is the long term role of the development of Hilton Head as a community where traffic flows at a most efficient form? That is what I am concerned about. I am concerned with the dialogue with these neighborhoods or with the family plots. Can the Town look at the possibilities of futuristic traveling and futuristic development at the same time in terms of what will and won't be allowed.

Chairman Grant said he wanted to add one more if possible. I agree with the five dwellings, based on the LMO we want to be consistent. The only thing I would ask is if we have a neighborhood or road on the Island that serves less than five dwelling but is in dire need that the Town looks at it and bring it to our full Council for discussion so at least we could be able to be a part of making that decision. What I mean by dire need is low income has to be a stipulation, you already have 100% participation that they are willing to give up that right and we also have the Fire Department or Police determine that this road is a danger in some form that is very difficult to pass. If we have something similar to that, I believe it should be brought up to a Public Facilities Committee Meeting or Town Council for discussion. Councilman Grant asked if he had support for that and was advised he does. Councilman Grant said he believes he has full Council approval for it to be added. Councilman Lennox asked if this would be added as a 1 a). Chairman Grant said yes.

Chairman Grant moved to approve the topics for the day in addition to adding the 1 a) as discussed. Councilman Ames seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**5. New Business**

None

**6. Adjournment**

Councilman Lennox moved to adjourn. Councilman Ames seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Karen D. Knox  
Senior Administrative Assistant



# **TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND**

## *Community Development Department*

**TO:** Stephen G. Riley ICMA~ CM, *Town Manager*  
**VIA:** Charles Cousins, AICP, *Community Development Director*  
**VIA:** Jennifer Ray, ASLA, *Planning & Special Projects Manager*  
**FROM:** Jayme Lopko, AICP, *Senior Planner*  
**CC:** Shawn Colin, AICP, *Deputy Director of Community Development*  
**DATE:** January 12, 2018  
**SUBJECT:** Public Art Site Selection

---

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Public Facilities Committee forward a recommendation to Town Council to approve Coligny Beach Park as a potential site for placement of Public Art on Hilton Head Island.

**Summary:** Although most pieces of art donated to the Town are purchased by the Public Art Committee as a result of their Biennial Public Art Exhibition, pieces are sometimes donated with the intent of being included in the Town's public art collection. As the Town's public art collection grows the Public Art Committee identifies potential sites that would be suitable for the placement of public art.

**Background:** The Community Foundation of the Lowcountry created a Public Art Fund for the purposes of funding and acquiring public art and outdoor sculpture to be placed in the public realm on Hilton Head Island. This request will support the Public Art Committee's effort to build upon the collection of public art pieces located in public places.

There have been ten sites previously approved by Town Council, three in September of 2010, two in September of 2012, one in 2014 with the approval of the park improvement plan for Shelter Cove Community Park, one in April of 2015, and three in March of 2016.

- Site A: Former Welcome Center site on US 278
- Site B: Jarvis Creek Park Lake
- Site C: Town-owned parcels in the Chaplin Community (on west side of US 278 past Sherwin Williams store and before the old Cracker Barrel Site)
- Site D: Former Rock's Location
- Site E: Town-owned Marshfront Parcel in Stoney Area
- Site F: Shelter Cove Community Park
- Site G: Veterans Memorial at Shelter Cove Community Park
- Site H: New Coligny Park
- Site I: Old Gullah Market

- Site J: NW corner of Squire Pope Road and William Hilton Parkway

After reviewing these locations with Town staff, the following site has been submitted by the Public Art Committee to Town Council for consideration:

- Site K: Coligny Beach Park

Main Attachments:

*Attachment A:* Site K Location Map: Coligny Beach Park

*Attachment B:* Letter from Community Foundation of the Lowcountry Public Art Committee





TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND  
ONE TOWN CENTER COURT  
HILTON HEAD ISLAND, S. C. 29928  
PHONE (843) 341-6000

# Town of Hilton Head Island Coligny Beach Park Location



175 87.5 0 175 Feet

This information has been compiled from a variety of unverified general sources at various times and as such is intended to be used only as a guide. The Town of Hilton Head Island assumes no liability for its accuracy or state of completion.



4 Northridge Drive, Suite A • Post Office Box 23019 • Hilton Head Island, SC 29925

P: 843.681.9100 • F: 843.681.9101 • cf-lowcountry.org

November 17, 2017

The Honorable David Bennett  
Mayor, Town of Hilton Head Island  
One Town Center Court  
Hilton Head Island, SC 29928

Dear Mayor Bennett,

The Town of Hilton Head Island and Community Foundation of the Lowcountry have worked together for nearly 10 years to successfully secure large-scale sculptures to create and grow the Town's public art collection. To date, seven sculptures have been installed on Town property around the island. Each location has been approved by the Town.

We have several sculptures that we would like to add to the Town's public art collection. Additionally, we would like the Town to approve a location for them. This letter will serve to request that the Town consider these actions.

1. We would like the Town to approve Coligny Beach Park as a site for permanent installation of public art pieces.
2. We request that the Town approve two new sculptures to be added to the public art collection.
  - a. "Sandy Roads," by local artist Mark Larkin, is a piece that was part of our 2013 Public Art Exhibition on Hilton Head Island. After the exhibition Larkin donated the piece to the Community Foundation. The sculpture was slated to be installed in the new Coligny Park, but with the park's uncertain completion date, it's been suggested that Coligny Beach Park is a more appropriate spot. We request that the Town accept "Sandy Roads" into its growing public art collection. Attached is a photo, along with a description and maintenance requirements.
  - b. We have been approached by a group of cyclists who want to celebrate cycling with a piece of permanent art. They've commissioned Kevin Lawless, a highly regarded local artist, to create "CYCLE." The piece, if approved by the Town, will be gifted to Community Foundation of the Lowcountry and subsequently donated to the Town of Hilton Head Island. I've attached additional information about this piece, as well.

We appreciate what the Town does to help make the public art program so successful. Thanks for your consideration,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jean M. Heyduck", is written over a horizontal line.

Jean M. Heyduck  
Vice President for Marketing and Communications