



**PROPOSED AGENDA
OAK ISLAND PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2026 – 6:00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS -- OAK ISLAND TOWN HALL**

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADJUSTMENT/APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[Approval of January 27, 2026 Planning Board meeting minutes
012726PlanningBdMinutes](#)

PUBLIC COMMENT

I. OLD BUSINESS

- I.1 [Proposed Text Amendment to Section 10.19.6.1. of the Unified Development Ordinance
Sec. 10.19.6.1 -Urban Form Development Standards & Incentives - Zoning District Addition](#)

II. NEW BUSINESS

- II.1 [26-00097 - Proposed Text Amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance Section\(s\) -
8.1.1.10.1, 7.2.2., and 7.11.1.
Section 7.2 - Accessory Structures
Section 7.11 - Swimming Pools
Section 8.1.1.10.1. - Accessory Building Placement](#)

III. BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

IV. STAFF REPORTS

V. ADJOURN

**PLANNING BOARD
AGENDA ITEM MEMO**

SUBJECT: Approval of January 27, 2026 Planning Board meeting minutes
DATE: February 13, 2026
DEPARTMENT: Administration

Subject Summary: Approval of January 27, 2026 Planning Board meeting minutes is recommended.

Attachments:
[012726PlanningBdMinutes](#)

Financial Impact Statement: n/a

Legal Review: n/a

MINUTES
PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2026 – 6:00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS – OAK ISLAND TOWN HALL

Present: Vice Chairman Durrall Gilbert, Board members David Purser, Gene Brooks, Barbara Textoris, and Reece Simmons, Development Services Director Matt Kirkland, Planning Manager Taylor Davis, and Deputy Town Clerk Erin Baker.

Vice Chairman Gilbert called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. He noted this was the first meeting of the 2026 calendar year and the first meeting where the traditional Thursday morning meetings were moved to Tuesday evenings. The Vice Chairman explained this change was made to allow citizens who work during the day to tune in live, attend the forum for open comments, and participate more directly in meetings. The Vice Chairman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ADJUSTMENT/APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

There were no adjustments to the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Brooks motioned to approve the December 18, 2025 Planning Board minutes and Mr. Purser seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no citizens who wished to comment.

I. OLD BUSINESS

No old business was discussed.

II. NEW BUSINESS

II.1 Proposed Text Amendment(s) to the Unified Development Ordinance - Section(s) 10.16.3 and 10.19.6.1.2

Planning Manager, Taylor Davis, presented Urban Form Development incentives, continuing the discussion from the previous meeting. She explained that they were looking for additional incentives with "more meat" that would be more tangible for applicants to benefit from when they apply.

Ms. Davis explained that this amendment was an addition to the new section added previously (10.19.6.1.2) and would provide an incentive to reduce transparency requirements for building facades facing a street. The proposal would reduce the front facade requirement from 25% to 15% and the side facade from 15% to 10%.

Ms. Davis shared that this idea came directly from feedback from two business owners who indicated that the transparency requirement was a deterrent for new buildings due to cost. She provided a cost breakdown showing that for a 2,200 square foot wall, the required 550 square feet of glass would cost approximately \$99,000, compared to \$8,000 for the same area of hardy board siding. The proposed reduction would lower the required glass area to 330 square feet, resulting in approximately \$40,000 in savings.

During discussion, Gene Brooks questioned where the original 25% requirement came from and why 15% was chosen as the new percentage. Ms. Davis explained that a 10% reduction aligned with what could typically be approved as an administrative adjustment.

Several board members, including Vice Chairman Gilbert, expressed concern about reducing the standard by such a significant percentage based on feedback from just two business owners. He suggested maintaining the 25% standard but offering alternatives or credits that could reduce it to 15% if certain other aesthetic elements were incorporated.

After considerable discussion, the Board agreed to move forward with allowing the reduction to 15% if the missing 10% was achieved through alternative architectural elements. Ms. Davis drafted revised language that would allow the reduction: "Facades of applicable structures facing a street along the front line may reduce the required transparent features to 15% of the surface area on the ground floor and on corner lots and the transparency requirement may be reduced to 10% along the side street lot line(s) when in addition to the requirements of 10.19.6.1.1.b. architectural treatments such as faux windows, light boxes, shutters, and other architectural elements which break up the bulk of the wall are constructed or installed on at least 10% of the facade surface area." The Board requested that vegetation also be included among the alternative options.

Mr. Purser motioned to approve the amendment as worded and read by Ms. Davis, including the provision for vegetation. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

II.2 Proposed Text Amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance - Section 10.19.6

Ms. Davis presented a proposal to remove minimum parking requirements for most commercial uses, including retail, restaurants, and recreation. She explained that current parking calculations are often arbitrary and not reflective of businesses' actual needs, citing examples where parking lots sit mostly empty. The existing requirements limit commercial areas with asphalt that generates no tax revenue and deters small investors due to the high cost of improving large parking areas.

Ms. Davis clarified that eliminating minimum parking requirements would not prevent businesses from installing parking if needed or desired - it would simply give them autonomy to determine what is best for their business. She noted that ADA parking spaces would still be required per building code. Additional benefits would include allowing shared parking without time or use restrictions and enabling existing spaces to be repurposed for outdoor seating, food trucks, or other needs.

The Board had significant concerns about completely eliminating parking requirements. David Purser worried about opening a "Pandora's box" that could lead to businesses maximizing building space with no parking. Gene Brooks expressed concern that parking problems would become "everybody's problems," with cars overflowing onto residential streets and potentially blocking emergency vehicles.

Mr. Gilbert acknowledged that while he supported the direction of the proposal, he was concerned about implementing such a significant change without having public parking infrastructure already in place. He suggested possibly reducing requirements by a percentage rather than eliminating them entirely.

Economic Development Manager, Hallie Willis, provided additional context, explaining that the Town's streetscape project with on-street parking on side streets would be a 10-12 year buildout, but cheaper alternatives could be implemented in the meantime, specifically in commercial zones. She noted the Town was working on public parking lots and targeting areas with known parking problems, with significant progress expected in the next 1-3 years.

Matt Kirkland provided background on parking research, noting that setting any minimum parking requirement tends to be arbitrary, with no accepted standard. He explained that many jurisdictions and even entire states were moving away from minimum parking requirements, recognizing that business owners typically know exactly how many spaces they need.

After thorough discussion, the Board decided to move forward with the complete elimination of minimum parking requirements.

Gene Brooks motioned to adopt the staff recommendation as written, with no minimum parking requirements. Reece Simmons seconded and Barbara Textoris voted in favor of the motion. David Purser and Vice Chairman Gilbert opposed. The motion passed.

III. BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Purser mentioned observing vehicles stuck in the right-of-way.

Vice Chairman Gilbert commented on the Beach Renourishment project, noting its impressive progress and praising the work crews for their dedication despite cold weather. He noted that the beach was looking excellent and would provide ample space for citizens to enjoy

IV. STAFF REPORTS

Ms. Davis reported that Justice Herman was no longer with Development Services, and they were seeking to fill the Planner I position. She mentioned they had received good applicants and hoped to have the position filled soon.

V. ADJOURN

David Purser motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:46 PM and Reece Simmons seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

David Bradley, Chairman

Attested: _____
Erin Baker
Deputy Town Clerk

**PLANNING BOARD
AGENDA ITEM MEMO**

SUBJECT: Proposed Text Amendment to Section 10.19.6.1. of the Unified Development Ordinance
DATE: February 13, 2026
DEPARTMENT: Development Services

Subject Summary: BACKGROUND

At the December 12, 2025, meeting, the Planning Board heard and approved several text amendments which established a series of urban form development standards and associated incentives for voluntary compliance. The development standards were intended to support the Streetscape Master Plan which looks to strategically improve sections of Oak Island Drive to improve pedestrian infrastructure, public parking, and landscaping in an effort to enhance our commercial area on along this street. The text amendments were recommended to be applicable to all commercial zoning districts that could exist along Oak Island Drive. The text amendments were later heard by the Town Council at the January 20, 2026, meeting. The Town Council approved the text amendment for the CB, Community Business district but requested staff bring the amendment back to the Board to discuss the applicability of the incentives to other areas of the Town, specifically, in commercial areas along Long Beach Road and Highway 211.

SUMMARY

Following the Town Council meeting, Staff reviewed and discussed the proposed text amendment, the goals of the commercial code repair, the streetscape master plan, and the Town's vision for Oak Island Drive, N.C. 211, and Long Beach Road. Staff determined the proposed urban form development standards were best applied to properties along Oak Island Drive, rather than the other named areas. The Town does not intend to improve Long Beach Road or Highway 211 with sidewalks or other pedestrian infrastructure at this time, as both are considered to be vehicle dependent areas. The Town's "placemaking" initiatives are focused on Oak Island Drive, as such, the urban form development standards and associated incentives were intended to stimulate improvement and (re)development in this specific area.

The Town may look to amend standards for signs, site plan and facade requirements, and other development regulations which impact commercial development as a whole in future versions of the UDO.

Staff recommends approval of the previously presented development standards and incentives for all commercial and civic zoning districts along Oak Island Drive to include the CB, Community Business, CR, Commercial Recreation, and O&I, Office and Institutional districts.

COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN CONSISTENCY

The proposed amendments were found to be consistent with the 2025 Comprehensive CAMA Land Use Plan. The amendments support Objective 1.1 to Strategically Update the Town's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to Enhance Community Health and Function when the amendments to Article 10 may serve to reduce traffic conflicts along Oak Island Drive and promote a healthier walkable community. Objective 1.2 Promote Actions

and Development that Forward the Vision and Character of Oak Island are supported when development and redevelopment which adheres to the Town's vision for the future of Oak Island is facilitated by changes to the ordinance.

Attachments:

[Sec. 10.19.6.1 -Urban Form Development Standards & Incentives - Zoning District Addition](#)

Suggested Motion: Motion to approve the text amendment to Section 10.19.6.1. of the Unified Development Ordinance.

Financial Impact Statement: N/A

Legal Review: N/A

SECTION 10.19 OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS.

10.19.6.1. Urban Form Incentives in the CB, CR, and O&I Districts

The Town of Oak Island encourages rear parking and looks to reduce the number of driveway accesses on Oak Island Drive in the CB, CR, and O&I districts. To further the goals of the Streetscape Master Plan and objectives of the Comprehensive CAMA Land Use Plan the Town offers incentives as set forth in 10.19.6.1.2. for those who voluntarily comply with the recommended urban form development standards as listed in 10.19.6.1.1. Each of the recommended urban form development standards must be satisfied to qualify for the applicable incentives.

**PLANNING BOARD
AGENDA ITEM MEMO**

SUBJECT: 26-00097 - Proposed Text Amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance Section(s) - 8.1.1.10.1, 7.2.2., and 7.11.1.
DATE: February 13, 2026
DEPARTMENT: Development Services

Subject Summary: BACKGROUND

Ross Smith, applicant, has submitted a request for text amendment to Section(s) 8.1.1.10.1, 7.2.2., and 7.11.1 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Specifically, the applicant seeks to revise the prescribed setbacks for ground level accessory structures located in the rear on through-lots.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The proposed amendments would allow ground level accessory structures such as swimming pools to be constructed in the rear of a through-lot utilizing the accessory structure setback from all property lines.

The current ordinance does not allow accessory structures, whether ground-level or higher, to be constructed within the required front yard (front setback). Through-lots are unique in that the front yard setback is applied to both the front and the rear of the property since both the front and the rear have road frontage. Section 8.1.1.10.1. currently reads (accessory structures) "Shall not extend beyond the front edge of the principal building or beyond the minimum front building line..." therefore, accessory structures in the rear of a through-lot must comply with a front setback which is more restrictive than a typical accessory structure setback or even a rear setback for a principal structure. The more restrictive setbacks applied to through-lots lessen the amount of useable space in comparison to non-through-lot parcels.

In most residential zoning districts, the accessory structure setback is eight feet (8'), while the front setback in most zoning districts is twenty-five feet (25').

Emergency Management did not indicate concerns with allowing ground level accessory structures eight feet (8') from the property lines on through-lots.

Staff is supportive of the proposed amendment which would see increased buildable area for ground-level accessory structures to property owners.

COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN CONSISTENCY

The proposed amendment is consistent with Objective 1.1 of the 2025 Comprehensive CAMA Land Use Plan to "Strategically Update the Town's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to Enhance Community Health and Function when the UDO is amended to allow for increased functionality on parcels within the Town's jurisdiction.

Attachments:

Section 7.2 - Accessory Structures

Section 7.11 - Swimming Pools

Section 8.1.1.10.1. - Accessory Building Placement

Suggested Motion: Motion to approve the text amendments to section(s) 8.1.1.10.1, 7.2.2., and 7.11.1.

Financial Impact Statement: N/A

Legal Review: N/A

SECTION 7.2 ACCESSORY BUILDINGS/STRUCTURES.

7.2.2. Accessory buildings shall not extend beyond the front edge of the principal building or beyond the minimum front building line, whichever is greater, except on flag lots, where pools may be allowed beyond the front edge of the principal building on the water side or on through lots where ground level accessory structures may be constructed with the prescribed setbacks of the district for accessory structures along all property lines in the rear.

SECTION 7.11 SWIMMING POOLS

7.11.1. The setback for a swimming pool from any lot line shall equal the required setback for accessory structures in the district in which it is located. Swimming pools are not allowed in the required front yard area, except on through-lots where ground level accessory structures may comply with the accessory structure setbacks of the district in the rear. Pools on ocean front lots shall meet any requirements of the Coastal Area Management Act and the North Carolina Division of Coastal Management.

8.1.1. Dimensional Table Notes.

8.1.1.10. Accessory building placement.

8.1.1.10.1. Shall not extend beyond the front edge of the principal building or beyond the minimum front building line, whichever is greater, except on flag lots, where pools may be allowed beyond the front edge of the principal building on the water side or on through lots where ground level accessory structures may be constructed with the prescribed setbacks of the district for accessory structures along all property lines in the rear.