

MINUTES OF THE ISLE OF PALMS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
March 9, 2011

The Isle of Palms Planning Commission met in the City Hall Conference Room, 1207 Palm Boulevard on March 9, 2011 at 4:30 p.m. Members attending included Bev Ballow, David Cohen, Ron Denton, Pete Doherty, Diane Oltorik, Noel Scott and Don Smith; the Director of Planning Douglas Kerr was present, as well. The press had been notified of the meeting, and the agenda for the meeting was posted in City Hall and the Building Department to comply with the Freedom of Information Act.

Chairman David Cohen called the meeting to order.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The next item on the agenda was the review of the minutes of the February 9, 2011 meeting. Ms. Oltorik explained that during the miscellaneous business discussion, Ms. Ballow inquired about the appropriateness of the Planning Commission making recommendations to improve participation in the recycling program in the City. Mr. Kerr explained that he would add these comments to the minutes. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes as amended and the vote was and unanimous in favor of the motion.

#### RECOMMENDATION ON RADIO TOWER ORDINANCE

Mr. Kerr explained that the existing ordinance allows the construction of communications towers when specific conditions are met. He stated that there were two sets of criterion, one that allowed staff approval of towers up to one-hundred feet (100') and a second that allow the Board of Zoning Appeals to grant a Special Exception for a tower up to one-hundred and sixty feet (160') tall. He explained that ordinance being considered would add new provisions that would allow the construction of a tower for public service uses for governmental purposes up to two-hundred feet (200') in height. He added that these provisions would be added to the section that could be approved by the Zoning Administrator.

Mr. Kerr explained that the City Council had been working with Charleston County on radio reception issues and it appeared that a possible solution to the issues would include a taller tower at the 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue cellular tower site. He explained that representatives from the tower owner, Crown Castle, were present to answer technical questions regarding the site.

Ms. Oltorik explained that she had been aware of the problems with the public safety radio system for several years and she felt that this change was necessary to improve their system.

Mr. Denton explained that he would like to know if the problems with the public safety communications system could be fixed with a tower lower than 200 feet. Mr. Keith Powell, with Crown Castle, addressed the Commission and explained that while there were several different alternatives to improve radio transmission, the taller tower at the site on 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue appeared to be the most desirable.

Mr. Cohen explained that he was concerned about the tower being able to be approved at the staff level and asked why it was not under the Board of Zoning Appeals section. He added that he was also concerned that subsection (11)(c) would allow a commercial entity to partner with any governmental agency and get approval for new towers up to two-hundred feet (200') in height.

Mr. Kerr explained that he did not believe that changing the approval process to the Board of Zoning Appeals would add much protection. He stated that if the Board of Zoning Appeals found that a 200-foot tall tower for the City at the 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue site met the criteria spelled out in the ordinance, he did not see how the Board could defend not approving the identical tower for a different governmental agency.

Mr. Jonathan Yates, attorney for Crown Castle, arrived and explained that he had helped draft the City's original communications tower ordinance and he had worked on this amendment with the City Attorney. He explained that they drafted the ordinance to allow two-hundred foot (200') tall towers only for public service uses and only for governmental agencies.

Mr. Kerr explained to Mr. Yates that the Commission has expressed concern about the fact that any governmental agency could get a tower approved and then any commercial carriers would be allowed to collocate on the tower. He asked if it would be acceptable to narrow the list of governmental agencies to include only the City and the County. Mr. Yates answered, yes, that he thought that would be reasonable.

Mr. Doherty made a motion to recommend the approval of the ordinance, with the condition that the list of governmental agencies that would be allowed to construct a two-hundred foot (200') tall tower be limited to the City of Isle of Palms and Charleston County. The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

#### DISCUSSION OF PARKING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND PUBLIC FORUM

Mr. Cohen explained that the City held a forum recently and he asked for general discussion from the Commission about their impressions of the forum.

Mr. Scott addressed the Commission and read a recap of what speakers at the forum advocated (see attached "Exhibit 1" for details). Mr. Scott explained that he supported a

plan for limiting the amount of public parking to the amount required to comply with OCRM's guidelines for beach management plans to qualify as having beaches with "full and complete public access". He explained that he believed that these guidelines could be met by establishing three or four parking spots at each beach access path and making all other areas of the island unavailable to visitor's parking.

He added that he believed that it was critical that the plan be extremely simple to execute and administer. He showed an example of an honor box for taking payment to park and stated that he believed a beach services officer could monitor the areas of visitor parking and enforce the requirement that they pay to park.

He handed out aerial photographs of many of the beach accesses that he had overlaid with a sketch to show possible parking areas.

He added that he thought there was merit in the ideas of providing parking for golf carts and bikes, providing shuttle buses or trolleys to redistribute visitors, and opening up parking on Ocean Boulevard.

Ms. Oltorik distributed a written analysis of the public speakers' comments/e-mails and a written proposal to accommodate beach visitor parking (see attached "Exhibit 2" for details).

She explained that she supported the idea of limiting visitor parking to parallel spaces on the ocean side of Palm Boulevard and Ocean Boulevard from the commercial district to 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She added that she believed that this would have the effect of more evenly distributing the beach traffic throughout the island and that she believed that the number of spaces available to the public would generally be equal to what is being currently used. She explained that she thought that these areas were more correctly characterized for beach visitors and that this approach was in keeping with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

She also explained that she believed that the public parking lots in the commercial area could be modified to accommodate approximately one-hundred (100) more vehicles, which she thought should be done.

She stated that she thought that it was reasonable to require beach visitors to pay to park.

She stated that she believed that this approach would have the effect of keeping beach visitors out of the neighborhoods and still provide ample opportunity for visitors to have access to the beach.

Ms. Ballow distributed her thoughts on the information gathered so far (see attached "Exhibit 3" for details). She stated that in the short term, she believed that the City should continue to pursue the installation of signs at the intersections, as they have already been doing. She stated that in addition to these signs, the City should clarify and unify the signs prohibiting parking closer than four feet from the pavement on Palm Boulevard. She stated that the existing signs were unclear and sometimes conflicting. She added that she felt that additional parking enforcement in these areas could improve things.

She stated that she liked the idea of limiting parking to the ocean side of Palm Boulevard and maybe ultimately moving the roadway away from the ocean to allow more space to park on the ocean side of the roadway.

She explained that she supported the idea of smaller parking lots, where feasible and she supported the idea of charging to park during the tourist season at peak hours (9 a.m. to 6 p.m.), just as the front beach area is currently regulated.

She also supported the general idea of not reducing the number of spaces currently used by the public, but spreading them out to different areas of the beach.

Mr. Pete Doherty explained that he had summarized the e-mails following the public forum and he had taken an inventory of what areas were available to visitor's parking and identified their characteristics in terms of when they were available, how much it cost to use the areas and other criteria (see attached "Exhibit 4" for details).

He added that he believed improved signage could help, including the typical blue parking signs to direct traffic to appropriate areas. He added that he supported the concept of opening up Ocean Boulevard to parking.

He explained that he supported the idea of a payment structure to park that supported car pooling. He explained that this provision could follow the concept of the HOV lanes, where cars with multiple passengers received a benefit, which in this situation could be a reduced parking charge.

He added that he felt that regardless of the direction that the Planning Commission chooses, he believed that it was very important to come up with a fully detailed plan of how the new parking system would work.

Mr. David Cohen explained that he saw potential conflict with many of the ideas that have been expressed and the City's Beach Management Plan. He quoted a section of the plan that reflected a City goal of providing open access to the public and he

questioned whether a plan of reducing the spaces that were available supported that stated goal.

He explained that he thought an online reservation system could be used to give visitors a parking pass to a certain area. He explained that this would minimize the amount of searching visitors have to do, as their reservation would have a clear area designated for them. And it would allow for the City to spread the parking areas out as they determined was appropriate. He also thought that the City had to answer the question of what does a visitor get when they pay to park that they do not get now and he thought that an online reservation service provided the visitor with a service that they are not currently given, a guaranteed area to park.

Mr. Don Smith handed out his written ideas about the goals in revising the parking on the island (see attached "Exhibit 5" for details). He explained that he felt that the City had an obligation to provide adequate and affordable parking to beach visitors. He explained that he felt that the Commission should support ideas that minimized the potential for accidents and injuries due to the expected increase in traffic and he thought that the Commission should look for ways to minimize the impact beach traffic had on the neighborhoods within the City.

He explained that he supported the idea of allowing parking only on the ocean side of Palm Boulevard and Ocean Boulevard and in the commercial district. He explained that this configuration allowed visitors to walk directly to the beach without crossing roads while keeping the traffic out of the areas of many of the neighborhoods. He added that he felt that this approach would comply with the standards outlined by OCRM for a Beach Management Plan.

He stated that he thought that the City should only pursue the removal of obstructions in situations where the demand in the area required removal.

The group generally discussed some of the ideas presented. They agreed that there appeared to be agreement on the ideas of limiting parking to the ocean sides of Palm Boulevard and Ocean Boulevard. They also agreed that there appeared to be agreement that charging a fee to beach visitors seemed to be reasonable.

Mr. Smith asked what the next steps would be for the Commission. Mr. Kerr answered that he thought that the group needed to agree on the concepts they wanted to pursue and then present those concepts to City Council to see if there would be general support. He added that if the Planning Commission and the City Council appear to be aligned in a general direction, he thought the next step would be to get input from the public on the ideas.

Mr. Doherty stated that he felt it would be beneficial for Mr. Kerr to create an e-mail of bullet points that he felt that the Commission were generally in agreement with to canvass the Commission members with to see if where there is consensus. The group generally agreed and Mr. Kerr explained that he would do this.

#### MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Ms. Oltorik explained that she had a scheduling conflict with the next date and asked if the member would consider moving the meeting up one week to April 6<sup>th</sup> at 4:30. The group agreed to make this schedule change.

The Commission asked that at the next meeting Mr. Kerr bring a projector so that they can look at aerial images of the areas used for parking. Mr. Kerr stated that he would do this.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Cohen, Chairman.

# Parking for the People

Please note:

The following is not necessarily the views of Noel Scott but of a collection of quotations and more of an attempt to address concerns of the speakers and e-mailers from the Isle of Palms parking forum.

Dick Watson, former commission member and retired attorney so eloquently said "Mr. Mayor, members of City Council, members of the Planning Commission, You were not elected and you were not sworn to look out for the interest of the rest of the State of South Carolina. Your job is to look out for the interest of the residents of the Isle of Palms."

Starting with Jim Owens who we all know does not want parking on Palm, then to Guy Taylor who said "If you decide to have parking on Ocean Boulevard Street, look at Palm Boulevard down there" indicating Palm's problems and back to Dick Watson who said "Please don't continue letting the rest of the State of South Carolina use our residential streets as a parking lot" and then Danny Austin agreed with Dick. Eddie Brown then said "I want to say me to" referring to former speakers. Jay Leigh said "I agree with 85 to 90 % of what everybody else has said". Donald Lauseng said "parking in our yards has got to go". Rosalie at 3405 Palm asked "Would you like to live in a parking lot?" Jimmy Carroll wants to "make it more attractive for people to go to the front beach and park". Rolf Gobian said "Could not agree more with what the other people said". Bobby Simmons said "I do like the idea of people parking more in the commercial district" and John Crouch said "I think the commercial district needs to be enforced as the heart of the town". Jim Edwards said "I think that if the Planning Commission and we as citizens of the IOP work together we can provide a solution that will respect the property rights of all of us."

The above citizen's comments indicate that, for the most part, the speakers at the parking forum want to either limit parking on Palm or have no parking at all on Palm. The City of the Isle of Palms, however, has an obligation to maintain full and complete access to the beach as a requirement of the Beach Front Management Program and can not deviate from the required parking access.

Mary Ann Luttrell indicated that smaller designated pay parking areas for maybe 10 cars would be in order. Guy Taylor also spoke of parking at the beach access rights of way. Danny Austin spoke of providing six or seven spaces. Eddie Brown said "we should put in angled parking on

## EXHIBIT 1

the accesses going to the beach” and John Walters said “I like what people said about smaller lots”.

To accommodate both the Beach Front Management Program and the above speakers, there are 53 equally spaced beach access points from 57<sup>TH</sup> Avenue to Breach Inlet which would not show bias to any one resident. Also there is easy access on the inland side again not showing bias to any one resident. The minimum number of designated spaces at these beach access points would ultimately be determined by the City’s Beachfront Management engineer, Chris Jones to assure full but minimum compliance of the Beach Front Management Act. The forum speakers have indicated they would like intrusive street parking kept to a minimum. Guy Taylor indicated he would like to see more handicap parking and Jay Leigh would like to see golf cart parking. Golf cart, handicap and bicycle parking would be convenient in the areas shown in the pass out, would allow direct access from the avenues and would accommodate the inland IOP residents to beach access.

To alleviate Bea Love’s fears of visitors infiltrating the inland neighborhoods and to eliminate Mark Tidwell and Carolina Boulevard’s parking problems, an island wide parking by permit only (other than designated pay spaces) would be implemented.

Eddie Brown says to provide parking and pay for it. Jay Leigh said “pay for parking is not a bad thing”. Jimmy Carroll also agrees with pay parking and making Palm parking premium parking. Mark Tidwell said “Everyone should have access but I’m sorry, it’s not free”

If pay parking is to be implemented at the beach access points and put in place in the next two years, the process must be kept as simple as possible. Daily, weekly or annual passes will require expensive administrative costs and if passes are provided and a space is not available it would also provide angry visitors. As Eddie Brown indicated, when the designated spaces are full, the spaces are full. A first come, first serve basis has no administrative cost. Small honor boxes as shown in the passout for designated spaces can be attached to the existing beach access sign posts and screened with shrubbery again keeping things simple with one city employee picking up the money and writing tickets.

If we are to accommodate Bobby Simmons, Jimmy Carroll, Eddie Brown and others in funneling traffic into the commercial areas where the existing lots are rarely at full capacity, John Adams says a shuttle or trolley running from the City and County lots up and down Palm and Ocean would redistribute the beach goers to less crowded beach areas when street parking is not available.

If a parking program is to be implemented in the next two years the financial aspects as well as the physical parking space obstructions and the intrusions to property owners must be kept at a

## **EXHIBIT 1**



minimum. Other phases of the program could include bike and pedestrian lanes, landscaping, restrooms and other improvements.

## **EXHIBIT 1**

D'O's  
COMMENTS.

March 9, 2011 PC Mtg

To: Planning; Commission members and Zoning Administrator

From: Diane Oltorik

Subj: 1. My analysis of public forum speakers' comments \* includes e-mails after 3/4  
2. My proposal for solution for day-tripper parking

EXHIBIT 2

I - Paid Parking A. 1) good idea : 9; 2) Bad idea: 3;

II - Where to Have Paid Parking

A. Open up ocean side of Ocean, but only where sidewalks start (6<sup>th</sup>): 2; not at all: 2;

B. Palm Blvd: 1) ocean side: 1; 2) creek side : 0; 3) neither side: 1;

C. Business district only: 1) current lots : 6; 2) parking garage: 3;

D. Buy a piece of property and make a new pkg lot with trash and rest room facilities: 5;

III - Residential concerns for Quality of Life in General 6;

A. Visitors don't care: 3; visitors do care: 2;

B. Keep parking out of residential streets: 1) all the avenues: 5; 2) also Hartnett, Cameron, Chstn, Carolina (plusPalm /Ocean): 5

C. Free parking passes for residents and guests; 4;

D. Signage: 1) better & understandable: 5; 2) enforcement: 2;

E. Use shuttles: 1) various stops: 1 2) business district only: 0;

IV - How to Pay

A. Kiosks: 1) good idea : 0 2) bad idea: 5;

B. Virtual only: 1;

C. Charge more on street than lots: 2;

V - State requirements

A. We can control and manage: 1;

B. State rights of way control: 2;

VI - Safety concerns

A. Pedestrian injury: 5;

B. Room for city vehicles and emergency vehicles: 1;

C. Widen Palm Blvd: 1;

VII - Golf Cart and Bike Parking - Where: 2;

VIII - Bike Lanes and/or Walking Paths:

A. 1) good idea; 1; 2) bad idea: 4;

IX - Obstructions: A. Take them down: 2; B. Build more of them: 1;

X - More handicap spaces : 2;

*PUBLIC FORUM - FEB 23; TOTALS OF COMMENTS INCLUDING EMAIL*

**EXHIBIT 2**

TALKING POINTS - PC MEETING WEDNESDAY MARCH 9 - RE PUBLIC FORUM OF 2/23

1. Parking only on Ocean side of Palm Blvd } parallel

(a) what creek side residents look out their front door to vs. what ocean side residents look out their front door to.

(b) residential character of Palm Blvd. Waterway side has 30% registered voters plus second home owners plus non-registered voter owners

© current # of blocks with most vehicles on high season weekends on creek side is from 22<sup>nd</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup> (excludes first block due to Lutheran Retreat Center) and on ocean side from 21<sup>st</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup>  
approximately 130 vehicles on creek side.  
approximately 32 vehicles on ocean side

2. Assuming a loss of the ability for 130 vehicles to park on creek side in the most popular blocks would be partly compensated for by opening up ocean side of Ocean Blvd from 6<sup>th</sup> ave. (the beginning of the sidewalk) up to Windjammer. This area of about 7 blocks, given the same parameters as above, could accommodate about 23 vehicles.

3. The city lots and the county lot together could accommodate about 100 additional vehicles.

4. Further, assuming a pay to park plan, I believe ultimately vehicles would park further down Palm Blvd, thus creating the "scale" or "spread out" philosophy some public forum speakers talked about, thereby compensating further for loss of parking on waterway side.

5. It would be ill advised to consider further parking around 41<sup>st</sup> to 54<sup>th</sup> because there is an asphalt walkway about 2 feet from the pavement, and parked cars would cover it.

6. The ocean side of Palm and the ocean side of Ocean are more correctly characterized as the tourist access to our public beach, and fit the philosophy of our Comprehensive Plan.

7. It would be asking for trouble to severely limit or altogether prohibit parking on Palm and/or Ocean. It would have the effect of thumbing our noses at SCDOT. We believe that SC regs give us the right to "regulate" traffic in our municipality, and regulation means "control by rule, principle, or system", but lets not ask for trouble.

8. I believe the overall effect of all of the above would be to reduce day visitor parking, keep day visitor vehicles out of our neighborhoods, and provide ample opportunity for our visitors, thereby protecting the quality of life for our citizens and being welcoming to our day visitors. This would be a good thing!

**EXHIBIT 2**

*From Dew*

**A. Long term best ideas gleaned from the meeting and other sources.:**

1. "Move" Palm Blvd. to the north (Waterway side) 8 feet. And have no parking on that side at all. Just a sidewalk and a bike path if feasible(if it fits)..

That would give room for a bike path and parking on the beach side. Require all beachside parking to be perpendicular (nose in) Thus no doors open towards traffic inc. bike traffic.. ( Later even - take control over rights-of-way)

2.. Add small lots where feasible, such as the post office property, the beach co.'s 'triangle' and other areas they and the city may own.

3. Charge for parking other than the lots on Palm and Ocean. Daily passes bought at local retail outlets (give them a cut) and the kiosks on front beach, adding a few at the PO lot and R&W etc. Also make a seasonal and an annual pass available through City Hall, and the PW bldg.

THE PERMITTED PARKING HOURS SHOULD BE RESTRICTED FROM , 9AM TO 6 PM, and from May 1 thru October (something).

**B. Middle period best ideas**

1. Issue 'residential parking permits for up to 4 cars per residential full time address. (These people /cars/ can park anywhere legal any time)...(Not the same as a hurricane pass as that allows business owners and their employees back on) . In season you have a party? Inform the police dept. and you get permitted. And install "no parking without residential permit" signs in neighborhoods.

2. Check with any possibility of expanding the city's lots. Either be re-configuration or actually adding a second story.

**C. THINGS WE CAN AND SHOULD DO NOW**

1. Finish placing the signs 15' from intersection from the corners. Everywhere, starting with Ocean and Palm and working back as time permits.

2 Most importantly replace all the Palm B signs (and elsewhere) that say either No Parking 4 ft from pavement or No Parking Within 4 ft from pavement, to read  
NO parking closer than 4 feet from road.

Or words that make even more sense.

Increase police street parking enforcement. ( I KNOW I see illegal cars every weekend day and more on Palm without tickets or police presence. The comment "whimsical" enforcement may not be totally accurate or fair but it is close. Suggest Council discuss a safety study, and see if the speed on Palm can be restricted to 25 mph for certain hours in season.

**EXHIBIT 3**

p.2

Here are some thoughts on less attractive ideas:

1) Shuttle bus. Perhaps Carta can come up with a partnership idea to ferry riders either from a park and ride stop in Mount Pleasant OR along Palm and Ocean - a few designated stops IF we reach an agreement to ban ALL parking during high season and times on Palm and Ocean. Only allowing parking on the lots, current and future).

2) Purchase empty lots that exist on Ocean, and Palm. I do not see this as a financial possibility. If we do need to spend money which we of course will, I would want to see the Palm Blvd road "moved" and bike path erected.

3) IF there were 'mini-lots', how can you do restrooms? Porta-potties, maybe, another expense that possibly can be covered with parking fees, but that is a pretty ugly thought - they smell and are an eyesore. On the other hand a bunch of parked cars is an eyesore.

4) Requiring property owners to remove R.O.W. obstructions any time in the near future. There are some ditches that might be closed on Palm, (they aren't active for drainage anyway) and some overgrown R.'sO.W. in front of vacant lots that perhaps the city could clear to the lot lines. - (every little bit helps even if it's a drop in the bucket, like opening Ocean would be).

5) Reducing the number of parking spots on Palm. This would have to be arbitrary and intrinsically not fair. First and foremost we have to be fair to all parties, and primarily to the resident property owners.

6) Just the institution of pay to park will do nothing for the traffic safety issue if we do nothing else. If that is what we do, it will put a lie to the idea that our primary interest is safety.

Finally, we need to control publicity better, to insure that 1) the facts get out, and 2) that the public gets informed and educated re what the city is doing.

Bev

## EXHIBIT 3

PD's notes

**IOP PLANNING COMMISSION**

**PARKING MANAGEMENT - PARKING LOTS LIST**

|    | <b>BEACH ACCESS PARKING</b>     | <b>WHEN</b> | <b>SPACES</b> | <b>COST</b> | <b>PROS</b> | <b>CONS</b>              |
|----|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| 1  | Avenues & Streets               | 365         |               | \$ -        | In use      | Neighborhood & control   |
| 2  | Breach Inlet                    | 365         |               | \$ -        | In use      |                          |
| 3  | City Hall                       | WE          |               | x           | Available   | Control                  |
| 4  | City lot - large                | 365         |               | \$ 5.00     | In use      | none                     |
| 5  | City lot - small                | 365         |               | \$ 5.00     | In use      | none                     |
| 6  | City lot next to post office    | X           |               | \$ -        | Available   | Not prepared             |
| 7  | County Park lot                 | 365         |               | \$ 7.00     | In use      | none                     |
| 8  | Front Beach - behind shops      | 365         |               | \$ 5.00     | In use      | none                     |
| 9  | Front Beach - kiosks            | 365         |               | \$1.00/hr   | In use      | none                     |
| 10 | Lot next to Pelican Cleaners    | X           |               | \$ -        | Usable      | Not prepared             |
| 11 | Lot next to Red & White grocery | X           |               | \$ -        | Usable      | Not prepared             |
| 12 | Lot on 4th street (?)           | X           |               | \$ -        | ?           | ?                        |
| 13 | Ocean Blvd.                     | 0           |               | \$ -        | Usable      | Obstructions             |
| 14 | Palm Blvd.                      | 365         |               | \$ -        | In use      | Safety & control         |
| 15 | Post Office                     | S           |               | \$ -        | Usable      | Permission needed        |
| 16 | Recreation center               | ?           |               | \$ -        | Available   | Other weekend activities |
| 17 |                                 |             |               |             |             |                          |

**EXHIBIT 4**

**IOP PLANNING COMMISSION  
PARKING MANAGEMENT - PUBLIC COMMENTS**

|      |                    | COMMENTS   |                                     |  |                      |                              |                             |                      |             |         |
|------|--------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------|
| NAME | RESIDE             | 1          | 2                                   | 3                                      | 4                    | 5                            | 6                           | 7                    | 8           |         |
| 1    | Anthony Wescott    | Mt. P      | No pay to park on Palm Blvd         | Never seen trash, urinating, changing  | Allow street parking | Outer Banks no pay to park   | Parking \$ just for revenue | Safety not an issue  | Enforcement |         |
| 2    | Danny Austin       | IOP        | Set terms & conditions for visitors | Look at Hilton Head restrictions       | Pay to park          | Parking @ beach access       | Add more lots               | Acquire green space  | Enforcement | Trash!  |
| 3    | Donald H. Lauseng  | IOP        | Keep neighborhoods private          | Publis lots only                       | Speeding             |                              |                             |                      |             |         |
| 4    | Eddie Brown        | IOP        | Designated parking areas, lots      | Stop visitors when all spaces are full | 2nd level parking    | No parking on blvd, st, etc. | Must pay for services       | Safety is an issue   | Enforcement | Trash!  |
| 5    | Janice Wages       | Mt. P      | Not pay to park                     |  |                      |                              |                             |                      |             |         |
| 6    | Jay Leigh          | IOP        | No additional pay to park           | Seasonal pass                          | More signage         | Golf carts & bikes           |                             |                      |             |         |
| 7    | Jimmy Carroll      | IOP        | High \$ for day parking on streets  | Funnel visitors to Front Beach area    | Lower \$ in lots     | Good beach access            |                             |                      |             |         |
| 8    | John Q. Adams #1   | IOP        | Ocean Blvd?                         | Park on Palm @ 41st +                  | No kiosks            | Property value               | Parking lots only           | Clarity of authority | Park & Ride | Need PR |
| 9    | John Q. Adams #2   | IOP        | Island shuttle bus                  | Handicap, senior, low income parking   | 2 level parking      | No charge after 6 pm         | Beach Co. parking lots      | Enforcement          |             |         |
| 10   | Lucinda Olasov #1  | IOP        | More cones at crosswalks            | No paid parking on blvds               | More signage         | Public lots only             |                             |                      |             |         |
| 11   | Mark Lindsay       | IOP        | Park & ride                         | No street parking                      |                      |                              |                             |                      |             |         |
| 12   | Mary Ann Luttrell  | IOP        | End game?                           | More small lots                        | Pay to park          | All spaces full; stop!       | No street parking           | 4th street lot (?)   | Enforcement | Trash!  |
| 13   | Paul Drennen       | CHS?       | No pay to park on Palm Blvd         | Enforcement; parking & trash           |                      |                              |                             |                      |             |         |
| 14   | Pearse Fitzpatrick | Mt. P      | Keep rules to a minimum             | Don't have surf only; swim only areas  | Enforcement          | No pay to park on blvds      | Enforce set backs           |                      |             |         |
| 15   | Scott Morris       | IOP        | No parallel parking on Palm Blvd    | Pay for permit parking only            | Safety first         |                              |                             |                      |             |         |
| 16   | Susan Craig        | off island | Foremost is quality of life         | Mini bus system from parking lots      | Pay to park          | Use traffic experts          |                             |                      |             |         |
| 17   |                    |            |                                     |  |                      |                              |                             |                      |             |         |
| 18   |                    |            |                                     |  |                      |                              |                             |                      |             |         |
| 19   |                    |            |                                     |  |                      |                              |                             |                      |             |         |
| 20   |                    |            |                                     |  |                      |                              |                             |                      |             |         |

**EXHIBIT 4**



Don Smith's  
Comments

## GOALS IN REVISING DAY VISITOR PARKING ON IOP

- Provide ADEQUATE and AFFORDABLE parking for day visitors
- Minimize potential for injuries and accidents due to the significant increase in the number of cars and pedestrians
- Minimize the impact on IOP neighborhoods
- Meet the parking requirements of the Beach Management Plan (BMP)

## ONE POSSIBLE APPROACH

- 170 VEH  
10 BUSES.
- Allow parking for day visitors ONLY in the county lot, the city lots and on the ocean side of Palm and Ocean Avenues
  - Remove incursions into the state right-of-way on a measured basis to add parking spaces as the demand for beach parking increases over time

## ADVANTAGES OF THIS APPROACH

- Visitors walk directly to the beach passing only one row of island houses
- Visitors do not need to cross any island roads
- No day visitor parking on any inland residential streets
- Visitors parking in lots and on Ocean Avenue are close to downtown businesses
- Meets the parking requirements of the BMP

## EXHIBIT 5