



SURFSIDE BEACH WORKSHOP MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
115 US HIGHWAY 17 NORTH, SURFSIDE BEACH, SC 29575
www.surfsidebeach.org - ☎ (843) 913-6111 📠 (843) 238-5432

TOWN COUNCIL CHAPTER 17 WORKSHOP MINUTES
TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2020 • 10:00 am

- 1. CALL TO ORDER.** Mayor Hellyer called the Workshop meeting to order at 10:00 am. Mayor Hellyer, Councilmembers Pellegrino, Dietrich, Holder, and Keating were in attendance. Mayor Pro Tempore Scoles and Councilmember Drake were absent. Others present Town Attorney Crosby, Town Administrator Pieper, and Town Clerk Sheri Medina.

Mayor Hellyer asked Council whether to proceed to cancel and hold off until everyone is present. Council agreed to proceed.

- 2. BUSINESS** – Review Chapter 17 – Mayor Hellyer stated that in the very beginning, there was a decision paper that was submitted by Ms Morris back on January 28, and it's not that long. I would like to read that decision paper, and then we'll take it from there and go over it.

QUOTE

1. SUBJECT: Ordinance #20-0913 to amend the Town's Code of Ordinances. Specifically, Chapter 17 [Zoning Ordinance] Article III: District and Use Regulations.

2. PURPOSE: To specifically list permitted uses allowed within the Town. Replace vague language to allow staff and the public alike to easily find if a use is permitted within a certain zoning district.

3. FACTS:

(a) The Town's Zoning Ordinance is a permissive ordinance. Section 17-008 of the Zoning Ordinance states:

SECTIONS 17-008 INTERPRETATION

When interpreting the Surfside Beach Zoning Code, the canon of construction expressiouniusestexclusioalterius' or 'inclusioniusestexclusioalterius' (i.e. 'to express or include one thing implies the exclusion of another or the alternative) shall be strictly observed. (If a use is not explicitly listed it shall not be permitted).

(b) A permissive ordinance list all permitted uses clearly and plainly not only for those that interpret the code on a daily basis, but also property owners, businesses and developers looking to invest in the Town. If a person is considering undertaking a particular land use, it is important that they know whether or not that would be allowed by the zoning Ordinance.

(c) The changes being proposed will better represent the Town when a request for a use is made to the department.

(d) As you can see in the 1st reading draft, several specific uses have been listed that were not specifically listed before. Vague language in an ordinance can lead to misinterpretations and angry applicants.

(e) Each individual use was reviewed and placed in compatible districts by the Planning Commission.

(f) Long Term Rentals were defined as 12 months or more. Certain uses are proposed as being accessory uses only.

This agenda is published pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act Section 30-4-80(A) and (E). The public is invited to attend all meetings and events.

(g) Massage Parlors are being proposed as accessory uses only.

(h) Staff requested Mr. Sammy Truitt have the Business Committee review the proposal prior to the Planning Commission holding a Public Hearing and making recommendations to the Council. Mr. Truitt reported back to the Planning Commission after the Business Committee reviewed Article III. He stated the Business Committee felt it was a comprehensive list, and they could not think of any use that needed to be included. Of course, if the use does present itself that is not listed as a permitted use the use can be submitted for consideration from Planning Commission and approval from Town Council.

(i) Another change you'll find is the addition of "Applicable standards." This ensures the applicant seeking information doesn't overlook the requirements of the Design Overlay, if applicable. We hear many times from a developer or business owner that they reviewed the ordinance section but did not know to look at other areas of the Ordinance for additional requirements.

(j) The amendments are being proposed to make the read more user-friendly.

(k) The town attorney has reviewed this Ordinance. Comments or recommendations were considered and/or included therein.

4. ACTION: The Planning Commission performed a thorough review of Article III and voted unanimously to recommend the amendments be approved as submitted for 1st reading.

END QUOTE

Mayor Hellyer then asked for discussion.

Councilmember Holder stated the major problem I have with this is the commercial area. If you go through the grid in this major area, you'll see that it's got every use that a business can do in that area. First, I don't feel like we're an HOA and should be limiting and controlling what a commercial business can do within their area. It stated the restaurants couldn't cater. It concerns me that we are getting into minute details. You've got to prove almost everything when you go into these commercial areas, just to make sure that you're fair to people that are in our business community. Like I stated before, there are many challenges that I see within the grid of looking at the commercial areas. Just like the hotels, it said that they couldn't have a store in it. Most hotels have a store. That would not be permitted under this. I think we're getting too much like an HOA telling people what they can and can't do. You can problems with too much detail.

Mayor Hellyer stated I remember talking to Ms. Morris before we put this before the Council, and she was saying that there were a couple of things in this, and she referred to it in the decision paper, she and the town attorney had agreed was something that needed to be changed.

Ms. Crosby, Town Attorney, stated on September 11, Ms. Morris, requested that I review massage parlors, but I pointed out that there was no definition of a massage parlor in 17-007. The non-conforming use ordinance says a non-conforming use can get a certificate; I think she made that change. Also, there was a proposed change to 17-396.9 about massage parlors. It states that the non-conforming use will continue until the current attendees discontinue the use, and I found Section 17-501 D, states that the status of non-conformity is not affected by changes ownership or management. So that was inconsistent. The second was revised to state that the existing non-conformity will be permitted to continue until such time the current business license becomes invalid or abandoned or one year from the effective date of this Ordinance. Ms. Crosby stated it is now consistent and appropriate.

Mayor Hellyer asked Ms. Coleman if she reviewed these documents. Ms. Coleman stated, yes. Mayor Hellyer also asked if she had any concerns with it.

Ms. Coleman stated I think one of the things we talked about, and we've talked about it with the staff, is the long term rentals and language for what constitutes a long term rental versus a short-term rental. So, I would, I would recommend that we look in more depth to that because it's tough to tell a property owner that they can't rent their property for less than 12 months. As to the list of uses, I've worked in situations before where we've used

industrial codes and classifications to reference them. So, if a new business comes along and it meets the requirements of what an existing business looks like, then we could say, yes, that would be allowed. This document looks pretty good, again, like I said, the long term rental versus short-term rentals, and that's more on the residential and lessen the visitor accommodation section. I don't know if the definition is the correct definition, but we proposed to make it for one year or less than the long term rounds over a year or more per year. No short-term rentals, in certain areas, I understand that. But I think a year is probably a little bit onerous for the property owner.

Mayor Hellyer confirmed that the Planning commission had extensive discussion on this and concluded that 1 year or more for the R1 district was appropriate.

Councilmember Keating stated I think if you go back to that Planning Commission meeting and read the meeting minutes, and most of the public comments were from residents in the R1 District saying, they're buying into Surfside because they want this family neighborhood and they want neighbors. They don't want somebody here this week, somebody gone the next or even in a few months. I have a couple of long term rentals, right close to me. The benefit of the R1 District is the maintenance of the properties. People that are there for a year, they're maintaining the property, they're taking care of their yards, they're planting flowers, they're making some of those improvements outside. If you get somebody in there and they're only renting a month or 2 or 3. they're not taking that much interest in the property. I think that's the primary purpose for probably from the beginning on why we have an R1 District and R2 district and R3 districts so that those distinctions are made. So, like everyone else that I read in the Planning Commission meeting of September 10, where this was greatly discussed, I think in the R1 District, it was decided by the Planning Commission and voted unanimously that the R1 District stays at the 365 days or more. I don't see why we need to re-debate that, that this was approved by the business committee, by the planning committee. Unless there are some specific problems we have, and I'd like to hear the specifics of each item that Paul was bringing up, I don't see anything that is grievous in here. I have a couple of comments that that seem to be inconsistent, but I don't think it's our place here to re-invent the wheel. Many people have worked hard on this. I don't think it's up for us to start over, but I think we should discuss those areas that we feel are inconsistent or maybe overreaching. Certain things that I know were hotly debated. I don't feel we need to re-invent those discussions at this time.

Councilmember Pellegrino stated I agree with Ms. Keating in the long term. I think the 365 day does give more ownership to those properties, and the R1 District do anything shorter. If you do three months or six months, it might have a questionable outcome on the look of the property. If they were to rent for any shorter than a year, they would be treated as a short-term rental, which you cannot do in R1. So, basically the R1 zone, there would only be 12-month rentals.

Ms. Coleman stated that language could be added to the definition to give it a more precise expectation of long term rentals vs. short term rentals vs. transient rentals. One of the things we've had calls on recently is a building where are numerous owners, and they're doing air-b.n.b. And we looked, and it's a PD (Planned Development). We looked in the language of their covenants and restrictions, and it indicates that it is for residents only, and not for transient accommodation. You can search AirBnB to see if there is a problem.

Mayor Hellyer stated one thing that we had to be taking into consideration, this debate in the Planning Commission went for months. There wasn't something that we just got together one night and decided we would do. Many people in Surfside Beach are snowbirds, where they come in in January and stay until the end of April. They do it every year. There were many things to take into consideration in the decision that we made to do it this way.

Mr. Pieper asked where do they fit in because if you read the definition of transient rentals, it's 30 days or less. So what happens to the snowbirds are here for a few months. They're not falling under the long term and not fallen under transient.

Ms. Coleman stated that we could look at a short-term definition. We have a transient definition. We have a long term definition. And that way, we could break it down because the long term applies in the R1 that you're talking about. What about other areas? Someplace it's 90 days, or, some it's 40 or 45 days. And then, transient can be night to night, week to week, or anything along those lines.

Councilmember Pellegrino stated most of the snowbirds who live around me in R1 own their houses, and most of the other snowbirds also rent in the R3 district. I don't even know if this is an issue. I haven't seen it to be an issue. Most of the renting snowbirds are renting the houses near the beach.

Mayor Hellyer invited additional concerns.

Councilmember Holder stated he had additional concerns about the restaurants. Also, there will be cases and the same with hotels, that some things need to be identified in the E-District (C4). We need to make sure we are covering everything we already have. Also, we only allow drive-thru's in C1. So, we are we saying that C2 and C3 can't have those.

Councilmember Keating stated that it would be difficult to insert a drive-thru capability into any of the existing facilities of the other districts.

Ms. Coleman stated that the main reason for that being a little bit more conservative with drive-thrus is that they typically have a higher traffic pattern. One of the biggest complaints you get from a drive-thru is just the sound of the speaker. When someone pulls up to make their order, the neighbors can hear that, and when they're open till midnight or even all night, it could bleed over, so having a limit on drive-thrus in a more commercial district is a good thing.

Councilmember Keating stated I think, that if you look at what already exists in C2 and C3, there's no space to take up the parking for that loop to try to get those cars around those buildings.

Mayor Hellyer stated, I hadn't seen this specifically, that if I owned a Malibu and I wanted to do a carry-out, and do delivery that I need a separate business license to do the delivery because that's separate from the other.

Ms. Coleman stated that you might look at Myrtle Beach. They have several regulations, too, in terms of how they interpret what's available. I don't know that they did that with carry out and delivery. But if it may be worthwhile that I look into that, because I know that they look at one of the new businesses, they had to go in there. They required them to get three business licenses. But, that is more of business license issue than a zoning issue.

Mr. Pieper stated I know a couple of comments that came up previously when this was discussed in conversation with Councilmembers. I went back to accommodations that Mr. Holder was referring to, the banquet facility. For example, most hotels have that. It's permitted C1 but not in C3. And that's where your hotel is, the C3. So that's something I would suggest that you had. I know right now they don't have that, they had it in the past. And I guess I'm trying to understand the interpretation of Resort 25 or more units with the differences there versus a hotel.

Ms. Coleman stated that I think one way we can take care of that is under the definition of what a hotel can include. Because many hotels have you mentioned a shop or snack bar or restaurant. If we dictate that a hotel can include these uses, it will fall under their purview; they'll be able to do that. But that's one that would be the primary use in this case.

Councilmember Keating stated I think it's there if you consider hotels, motels, and tourist courts would be more like the Days Inn, where we have oceanfront those would be the resort accommodations/ For those it starts to include all the accessory uses of the interior court lobbies, drug and sundry shops, florists gift shops, confectionery, stores, news, and lounges restaurants, snack bars I think that's where the distinction is coming from where?

Mr. Pieper stated that if it's going to be considered a resort, then it needs to be a permitted use.

Councilmember Keating stated that if you read the condition, the condition is actually to their benefit. The condition says if you have this Resort, in addition to being that Resort in those transient accommodations, you are now allowed all these extra accessory uses; the condition is a positive, not a restriction.

Councilmember Holder stated under C4 for almost nothing is permitted. Councilmember Keating, stated that we need to had the hotel and resorts to the E-District (C-4).

Councilmember Keating stated I saw another one in C4 that I thought about. The golf cart rentals, currently, we have that. I know there are plans to make that into a restaurant, but we currently have the moped and golf cart rental place in there. Is that something we want to maintain; do we want to allow that service so close to the beach to exist there. Maybe make that a conditional use.

Ms. Coleman stated you can place conditions on it so they don't have a lot of storage area, a lot of golf cart rentals and bike rental places rent them but store them in another facility.

Councilmember Keating stated the only other one I had circled in C4 that was missing was the possibility of a Microbrewery. That seems to be right up the C4-E-District alley. We could make this a permitted use.

Councilmember Holder asked what would need to be done if someone wants to do something that is not on this list, what do they need to do? Ms. Coleman said if there's something in here that is not specifically on the list, then we tell them that they could apply or a text amendment or they could ask someone, in the appointed or elected site, to instruct us, to add something in to discuss.

Councilmember Keating asked for clarification on whether the concern is if it doesn't exist in the list vs it is not listed as a permitted use. Section 17-202 specifically addresses modifications. It can be submitted for consideration through the Planning Commission, and then approval of Town Council. The ordinance talks about how to make amendments, or changes, or request changes to any kind of zoning if something comes up different, there's a whole list of what your application needs to say. We present it to the Planning Commission, they review it against the design overlay, the comprehensive plan, etc., and they provide the recommendations back to Council to approve or disapprove, then it would have to go through the same process. I think, depending on what their problem is, you've also got the Board of Zoning Appeals first if the use is listed, but non-compliance.

Ms Coleman stated you also have this appeal that says, as long as you have proper justification, the planning commission can consider making that change in use, as well as coming to Council for the final vote. I don't mean to belittle it, but there is no possible way you can consider everything, times change. And now, what was valid in 2000 is not valid in 2010, but fell in 2010, may not be in 2020.

Councilmember Keating stated I had asked Ms. Morris that question since Director King was putting forward the new designations for the business licenses. If this list kind of mirrored that one. And she said, yes they do.

Ms. Coleman stated as I said, the reason we added it, was to give the zoning administrator a little bit of latitude because new things were always coming along, and you'd see it there before you'd see it in a document like this.

Councilmember Keating thinks our business license categorization is consistent with our zoning categorization.

Councilmember Holder stated I think many questions have been answered that I had concerns about.

Councilmember Keating said, we did make 2 changes to address the E-district. Let's go through specifics so we can give that direction and have this document revised so that when we look at it again, we're ready for first reading.

Councilmember Pellegrino mentioned at the bottom of page three need to address the hotels and resorts in the E-district. Also, on page 12, the golf cart and it's conditions.

Councilmember Keating asked if the current police station and post office; those are public land designations, so we don't need that to be a conditional use in C1 since they're already there? Yes, it's a separate zoning.

Mr. Pieper stated that the assembly hall and banquet facility needs to be addressed with the C4 also.

Ms. Coleman stated in this case; I could see that as maybe a special event facility, you know because many people do like to come to the beach to get married. So, you might have someone that wants to come in and put a lot of money into a facility where they don't have a reception or something here to the beach.

Councilmember Keating stated I think you need to modify your resort accommodations listing. This designation for the Assembly hall, etc are stand-alone facilities. The Holiday Inn has a pretty significant room, and I'm sure so does Surfside Resort does too. To make sure that Resort means it has all those amenities under 17-396.33 amenities listing.

Ms Coleman agreed that's the perfect description is an amenity of the resorts, the resorts itself. Primarily is a place where people go to stay, but everything else falls under that.

Councilmember Holder stated I don't know what all the parking codes mean.

Ms. Coleman stated there are different codes for the different uses because, in some areas, you expect to have more traffic generated. I know there was some discussion on limiting the size of a hotel because you end up with many hotels in some situations, and that that can be a big problem. Because you've got multiple groups that are coming together to stay in one place, and if it's residential, it may require this many spaces. But when you see how many more people are coming, it can create problems. One thing I'd point out on here, under types of business D, and E, we included boarding houses on this chart because it was still in there the changes had been taken out, boarding houses that, traditionally, that's what people did when they came to the beach.

Councilmember Keating directed Mr. Holder to section 17-420 for the table with the definition of each parking code A – T.

Mayor Hellyer stated somebody wanted to build on that lot next to Borgata. They wanted to build a restaurant on the bottom and two apartments on top. Our Ordinance says that if you do that, you have to have a parking spot for every bedroom which they did not have because the Town owns all of the parking surrounding that, they lost on that, and they decided not to build. We lost out on a restaurant because of two parking spots, which everybody's been talking about ever since, how can that be remedied?

Ms. Coleman stated I could tell you that the new downtown district in Myrtle Beach did not put parking restrictions in there to start, because they know that at some point that the idea was to bring in residential to help support the downtown area. We put a threshold that after so many units were built, they would have to be parking created, whether or not a parking garage or some other means. Downtown Conway has several new apartments. They did not require parking for them, and it became an issue for some of the residents because they were upset that sometimes they couldn't find a parking spot, convenient enough to the door. I think the owner owned another piece of property, so he put signs up on that piece of property for some of the renters to make them happy.

Mayor Hellyer stated we want to promote our business but follow our ordinances. It's not like we have any fields that we can turn into parking lots. Our real estate is 95% built on. Parking is an issue in the C2 District.

Councilmember Keating asked that I thought they resolve that issue. They put the two spots in the back. The plan that I saw It had two parking spots behind the proposed building.

Mr. Pieper stated I did share with the mayor when I spoke with the previous planner about figuring out a way to make it work even if we had to lease them some spaces or put them in the new parking area around Benjamin's Bakery? I encourage them to figure out any kind of way to make it work because we're not like Conway, and we're not like, Myrtle, it's not like you have that many opportunities for this. That would have been a great project.

Mayor Hellyer stated he would like to speak about the 17-396-23 restricted locations. We debated a whole lot in the Planning Commission about having storage facilities not located on Hwy 17 business, but just on Sandy Lane. There are also other jurisdictions in the area, such as North Myrtle Beach, that they did not allow storage facilities on their 17 business. Their philosophy and our philosophy when we made that was there are 17 business was, our moneymaker, and we only have 1.9 miles of and Sandy Lane would be more appropriate for such use.

Councilmember Holder stated we have a lot of space to use on Hwy 17, and our Hwy 17 businesses are hurting. If we have the right facility, I still feel strongly about storage buildings they should be able to build if they build a nice place.

Councilmember Pellegrino stated I agree; I think we should leave the opportunities open, so we draw business, and we increase our tax base. The parking designation is still going to preclude the facility from being built anyway.

Mayor Hellyer, the only thing that I have to say on that is that the time this was done, at the September meeting, there was no application; that was something that the Planning Commission did before any application was submitted.

Ms. Coleman stated that I believe the application came in after the September meetings and had initial discussions with the Planning Department. I know the application was made in December.

Mayor Hellyer stated when we approved it in the Planning Commission to go before Council, that was before anybody had filled in an application.

Councilmember Dietrich stated I'd have to agree with Mr. Pellegrino and Mr. Holder on that topic, as far as what we're going to allow down there. I think it makes sense, keep our businesses going to where they're going, and you're right, Hwy 17 could use all the help we can get right now.

Councilmember Keating stated, I disagree. I think a storage facility on our main thoroughfare right when you come into Town, does not scream welcome to a family beach. We're about to undertake an initiative to talk about strategic thinking and how to rebrand our family beach. What do we need to be to re-invigorate our vision of being that family beach and certainly, a three-story, hundreds of square foot storage facility right in our prime real estate it does not scream family beach. This has been through the Planning Commission several times. It has been through public hearings several times. There have been no residents nor business owners that have supported this idea. 100% of the public comments put in every meeting that I've heard from September through the various meetings we've had about this particular piece of property have been opposed to it. I think we owe it to our Town and our residents to say we're going to make decisions that are in the best interest of the future of the Town. Having a huge storage facility right in prime real estate is not going to generate the revenue that the Town is going to want in the future. Don't forget we've got appeared to pray for. When you start using up all your available space or minimal revenue generation, it's not going to help. If the philosophy is any business is good business - I don't agree with that. It's not that we're saying you can't have it - that would be against the law - we have a perfectly good property that could be developed not on our main thoroughfare, not on our welcoming image over Town, we talk about all the new light fixtures and the new road that's going in and getting some banners so that, you know when you come into Surfside, you're in Surfside. And when you leave, you know, you left. Well, that big giant storage facility right on our frontage road right in the middle of Town is not going to support those initiatives. I don't want to discourage business, but I think we need to be sensitive to

what is located on our main thoroughfare. Making your main thoroughfare into an industrial complex is not going to benefit the family beach feel that we've all been commissioned to protect.

Councilmember Pellegrino stated I agree with some of that. They're not going to build it anyway because the room for the parking spaces restricts them. But I don't want to restrict any businesses, because I want people to come to us. I mean that lot can stay undeveloped for the next 20 years. I want people to feel free to come to us with ideas for businesses. It's looking like there won't be a storage unit there, because the parking restrictions, which is fine, but there may be something else we're not thinking of, you say, it would be an eyesore, but some of those new brick, storage facilities, have nice facades and if you compare them to some of the current facades, they are nicer.

Councilmember Keating stated you've got so much storage space on underutilized already. We've got I don't know how many different storage facilities already available. We've got the one behind Denny's, we've got the ones over Popular Ave with, how many more, up and down, that secondary level of businesses that they're, why do we need another one? They just built one over on Glenn's Bay Road, and that is a huge one. They're building one over off of bypass 17, which was a huge one. How many more do we need?

Councilmember Pellegrino stated that's a high revenue business, and that would be a big business license. But, regardless, you put a restaurant there, it's not going to touch revenues of a storage facility.

Councilmember Keating stated, I disagree. A storage facility is not collecting all the other tax revenue; it just sits there, and it's underutilized to start with. How is that going to generate revenue?

Mr. Pieper state what you don't want, though, is to have a situation where the rules are so restrictive that you lose opportunities too. You had a grocery store coming to what you now have is a power substation that pays zero tax. What an opportunity loss? I think we have many cases you lost out on because of the restrictiveness.

Councilmember Pellegrino stated that regardless, there are other businesses out there, and I agree with Mr. Pieper. I don't want them to come forward and give us a pitch, so we can consider it before they are just told, no, it's not an option. So, the fewer restrictions, the better.

Councilmember Keating asked if the matter is that fewer restrictions, or is that customer service training? Everything is subjective, and if we have proper customer service training of our personnel, that, an option is put forward, and you say, well, no that that's not allowed here, but, what do we need to do differently to make it mean that. That is customer service. Let me get back to you and get that discussion going, not just say, sorry, nope, sucks to be you. That's a customer service issue.

Mayor Hellyer, I hear all the time that people come into our planning and zoning and that they want to get something done, and the answer is no, many businesses, especially brand new businesses, that are coming into town, they don't want to work with a problematic government. They want to work with somebody who is going to promote them, and somebody that wants business. I think that my personal opinion is that we ought to have a liaison, somebody who works with people. I had a plan to do this before Ms. Morris that we would send out a letter to have a meeting for businesses and just have an open meeting. The one thing that I hear from everybody else is that if I go to Georgetown or I go to Conway, and I have an idea, and one of them was Firehouse Subs. He said that when he went to Georgetown to do Firehouse Subs, they embraced him, put their arms around them. They helped them find a location; they put him in business down there. Which was the first one in this area, and based on that model, he's been able to go to other jurisdictions and open it up. I would love to have that here and to have more business opportunities. I think that we need to be, at the same time, we need to be cautious about what we've put here so that we're promoting a positive image and our family beach and things like that.

We have 900 rental properties down there, and a limited number of places to eat. So, everybody right now is when they want to eat, they are going to Murrells Inlet, they going to Broadway at the beach, and other places to spend their money. We need to consider all these on what's best for Our Town.

Mayor Hellyer stated we all know everybody talks about we ought to have a Trader Joe's. Everybody says, there's a website that I can go to Trader Joe's, and it says, "Do you want to Trader Joe's in your neighborhood? Leave your name, address, and telephone number." Once they do that, Trader Joe's go into the computer, they look at the medium income, they look at the traffic count, and we ain't got it. I wouldn't want to take a risk and putting my high dollar value into someplace, and you can tell by what we have. We used to have a Taco Bell, it's not here, and we used to have a Hardy's it is gone. You know these businesses have closed down because they couldn't make it here. But then we have other businesses like Crabby Mike's rocks it. So there has to be that balance of getting good businesses here and make it not only profitable for the business, it's profitable for us, to keep our taxes low, we need to promote those businesses and get them going. As far as a big box, harbor freight is probably the only big-box store that we have in the Town. Also, we have two grocery stores.

Councilmember Keating asked if there were any other changes to the current document? Do we have any other public comments, or input to these discussions?

Councilmember Holder maintained that the paragraph of 17-396-8 restricted locations should be changed. No verbiage was provided.

Mayor Hellyer stated if everyone agreed to send the revised Ordinance back to the Planning Commission for review. We've put four recommendations in for the districts that were overlooked, we've now got an understanding of what's the difference between a hotel and a resort. The resort has different amenities, and we can expand the definition to include the potential, for other amenities,

Councilmember Keating stated I just want to make sure we're sending this back once and for all. We've made 4 modifications for the E-district that were overlooked, we've addressed the difference between hotel and resorts. What else was so grievous that deferred this to a workshop. If we're sending this back to the Planning Commission, let make sure we have everything identified so we only do this once more.

Ms Coleman also stated she would recommend additional language for definition of short term rentals.

Councilmember Dietrich made a motion to send the recommendations to Chapter 17 to the Planning Commission. Councilmember Holder seconded. All voted in favor. **Motion Carried.**

Councilmember Keating made a motion to retire to executive session in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, and to discuss contractual matters with the Atlantic Restaurant and returned to public session at the conclusion. Councilmember Holder seconded. All voted in favor. **Motion Carried.**

4. **EXECUTIVE SESSION-** Motion to adjourn Regular Meeting and enter Executive Session pursuant to South Carolina Code sections 30-4-70-(a)(1) and (2) to discuss negotiations incident to proposed contractual arrangements with Atlantic Restaurant group.

Mayor Hellyer stated there was no action taken in executive session.

5. **ADJOURNMENT.** Councilmember Keating made a motion to adjourn at 11:47 am. Councilmember Holder seconded. All voted in favor. **Motion carried.**

Surfside Beach Town Council

Robert Hellyer, Mayor

David Pellegrino, Town Council

Bruce H. Dietrich, Town Council

Cindy Keating, Town Council

absent
Michael Drake, Town Council

absent
Debbie Scoles, Mayor Pro Tempore

Paul Holder, Town Council

Attest:

Sheri L Medina, Town Clerk

Clerk's Note: This document constitutes summary minutes of the meeting that was digitally recorded, and is not intended to be a complete transcript. Appointments to hear recordings may be made with the town clerk; a free copy of the audio will be given to you, provided you bring a new, unopened flash drive. In accordance with FOIA §30-4-80(A) and (E), meeting notice and the agenda were distributed to local media and interested parties via the Town's email subscription list. The agenda was posted on the entry door at Town Council Chambers. Meeting notice was also posted on the town website at www.surfsidebeach.org and the Town's LED marquee.