



TOWN OF SURFSIDE BEACH  
115 US Highway 17 North  
Surfside Beach, SC 29575  
(843) 913-6111 Fax (843) 238-5432

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

April 7, 2009 6:30 PM

A G E N D A

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **AGENDA APPROVAL**
4. **MINUTES APPROVAL**      Approval of March 3, 2009 and March 23, 2009 Minutes
5. **BUSINESS**
  - a. Article III (Residential Districts Only) Review
6. **COMMITTEE COMMENTS**
7. **ADJOURNMENT**

**Submitted by:  
Jackie Donevant**

---

**Building, Planning & Zoning Director**

# Potential Discussion Items – Article III (Residential Review)

## RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS IN GENERAL

Are there any observed (or perceived) problems in the town's residential areas with respect to land use or new construction? If yes, are these problems a result of a lack of regulations, enforcement, public knowledge of existing requirements, or other?

## USE

From the listing of uses permitted in the town's residential districts, are there any uses listed which you believe may be inappropriate?

Excluding residential uses/occupancies, are there any other uses that should be considered for permitting in the town's residential districts? If yes, what conditions (if any) should apply?

What should the approval process be for nonresidential uses in residential districts? Should this been done administratively (as a conditional use) or should these uses require board approval (as a special exception)?

## SETBACK AND HEIGHT

Other than on corner lots (which are addressed in Article IV), are there any residential areas of the town where residents are finding it difficult to meet setback requirements?

Should the required setbacks consider the height of structures, i.e. setbacks increase based on increases in structure height, or do the current requirements work?

Are there any residential streets where special setbacks should be considered?

What structures, buildings, or other improvements should be exempt from setback and/or height requirements? (This question is tied to both Article II and Article IV).

## COMPATIBILITY AND OTHER

Are there any compatibility issues with respect to the size of newly constructed residential structures?

Are there any compatibility issues with respect to density, i.e. the number of dwelling units permitted by residential district? If yes, in what district(s) is this an issue?

Should aesthetics or architectural style be a consideration in the permitting of residential structures?

The minimum size of a Planned Development is one acre. Is this standard sufficient or should this requirement be increased?

# Potential Discussion Items – Article III (Residential Review)

## COMPATIBILITY AND OTHER (Continued)

Some communities incorporate standards for their manufactured home districts that specify a maximum age for new placements (or replacements), require a minimum roof pitch, specify under-skirting, etc. Should any of these requirements be researched for possible inclusion in the zoning ordinance or are existing requirements sufficient?

What other requirements do you think would be appropriate to consider for inclusion as part of the residential district requirements?

Are there any existing residential requirements (Article III) that you believe are inappropriate, too restrictive, and/or should be reconsidered by the commission?

## **Preliminary Listing of Technical Items Chapter III (Residential Districts Only)**

Listed below are items needing correction as identified in a preliminary review of Chapter III. This listing will be combined with any additional technical concerns upon review of the commercial district provisions. In addition, it is anticipated that this listing will be expanded pending the commission's discussion/direction per the April and May meetings.

Items identified for correction include:

1. There are discrepancies between the listing of permitted uses (and conditional uses) provided in Chapter III and the listing of permitted uses in the off-street parking chart (§17-290).
2. Permitted uses for the R-2 District include conditional uses, subject to their conditions, allowed in the R-1 District. Technically, these uses remain conditional uses in the R-2 District and should be listed under a conditional use header (§17-112).
3. The chart which appears in §17-73 should contain a fourth footnote which references the section containing the special setback standards for corner lots.
4. Home occupations are listed as a permitted use but are subject to conditions provided in the definitions section. These uses should be listed as a conditional use with cross-referencing back to the definitions section (or amend the definitions section and list the requirements for these uses under §17-88).
5. The permitted uses section in the R-3 District needs to be clarified (§17-132). It is unclear from the text and the use chart (Article IV) whether conditional uses previously allowed in the R-1 and R-2 Districts are also permitted in the R-3 District.
6. Pending changes to Article I, "mobile home" terminology will need to be changed.
7. §17-133(5) should be clarified. It is unclear whether this provision is designed to allow a zero-lot line type development (townhouse), a condominium type arrangement, or both. The distinction should be made to separate these uses from traditional multi-family arrangements (which are subject to a different density standard).
8. As a formatting suggestion, building and impervious surface area requirements, which are residential district specific, can be moved from Article IV to Article III. This would place district specific requirements in a common section.
9. The term "accessory dwelling unit" appears in this article but is undefined. A definition should be provided in §17-4 (Definitions).
10. §17-218 references the process for major and minor changes to a PDD. The cross-referenced sections do not specify a major vs. minor process. It appears the ordinance may have been later amended to remove the major and minor provisions.