

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

Comment Number	Respondent	Date Received	Comment	Response
1	CMain	9-6-18	Correct name to East Cooper Land Trust in second column on this page (3 times)	Edits made.
2	CMain	9-6-18	Add East Cooper Land Trust to partnership column on page 6-14 for action beginning “Address development -related issues...”	Edit made.
3	CMain	9-6-18	Add space between “and” & “Shem” page 5-37	Edit made.
4	GGilmore	9-4-18	Why “sea level rise”, “climate change” and “social justice” are not discussed in Comp Plan.	While not explicitly mentioned these themes are represented in various sections of the plan. Liz to add an action item.
5	JMcAuley	9-4-18	Couldn’t find mention of ADUs as alternative to offset the rising cost of real estate.	There is an action item that mentions ADUs. Add language “to offset the rising cost of real estate.” Conventional and Traditional Neighborhoods mentions them in the language.
6	KEllis	9-4-18	Proposed land use changes – like to see how that would affect future development/redevelopment (perhaps more maps showing “old” v “new”)	This is not the purpose of the plan to track parcel by parcel updates. There have only been minimal functional changes.
7	KEllis	9-4-18	Consistency with capitalization throughout document – Town/town; County/county; Hub/hub.	Can be reviewed for consistency during next round of formatting. Will check.
8	KEllis	9-4-18	Consistency with commas – p. 11, section 1.2 - should be “elements,” extra comma after housing	Edits made.
9	KEllis	9-4-18	Grammar 2.1 the vision “...with multiple travel options which safely connect...”	Edit made.
10	KEllis	9-4-18	Run on sentence 3.2 p 24 “Further, perceptions...”	Edit made.
11	KEllis	9-4-18	Sentence unclear: “As recently as 2007/8...”	Edit made.
12	KEllis	9-4-18	Better wording... “Survey results suggest...” p 25	Edit made.
13	KEllis	9-4-18	Fix “green spaces of in hubs” p 25	Edit made.
14	KEllis	9-4-18	Provide facts for “high cost of living” and “high median household incomes...”	Addressed numbers with Affordable Housing language. Liz may look ay MSA vs Town...
15	KEllis	9-4-18	Why isn’t Old Village/Shem Creek considered another “Cultural Core”?	Preservation of the Shem Creek area is discussed in district recommendations.
16	KEllis	9-4-18	Rewrite sentence b/c open space does not necessarily = flood control. P 35	Edit made.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

17	Kellis	9-4-18	Open space recommendations 1 – incentives for developers/redevelopment to include open space. 2 – Provisions to allow repetitive loss properties to be incorporated as open space.	Edit made.
18	Kellis	9-4-18	Is the mobility plan the same as the long-range transportation plan?	Yes
19	Kellis	9-4-18	Does the compound annual growth rate of the different roadways indicate that some roads should be prioritized for adding additional lanes/other.	It is one measure or indication among many that is used to determine when, where and what type of projects are needed or appropriate.
20	Kellis	9-4-18	Can the Town influence mobility in other ways, such as some kind of incentive for carpooling or HOV lanes?	HOV lanes are typically considered as part of DOT and interstate projects and studies. The town can encourage and support the use of HOV lanes if they are developed on I-26 on I-526 as part of regional commuting solutions. Carpooling incentives are often provided as part of employee benefits provided by large employers in an area. The Town can also support and encourage these efforts but will not likely have a primary role in their implementation.
21	Kellis	9-4-18	Ch 5 -#6 replace “improve” with “mimic the natural water cycle on site”.	Edit made.
22	Kellis	9-4-18	#9 tweak so that native plants are used to greatest extent possible, while avoiding exotics.	Edit made.
23	Kellis	9-4-18	“areas of interest” natural roadside buffer – odd term; better define?	Term used in zoning code. Added definition.
24	Kellis	9-4-18	“conservation areas” could be more than forests & wetlands. Expand definition to include other types of areas (meadows/creeks).	Edit made.
25	Kellis	9-4-18	No discussion of reducing impervious areas through redevelopment (narrower streets; pervious materials, etc.)	Adding recommendation.
26	Kellis	9-4-18	Middendorf Aquifer, not Charleston Aquifer (p 74). Also spelling p 75.	Edit made.
27	Kellis	9-4-18	Any goals for prioritizing use of treated wastewater effluent for irrigation/groundwater recharge?	Awaiting comments from MPWW. They have a few edits/comments.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

28	KEllis	9-4-18	How will green infrastructure/low impact development techniques be worked into redevelopment/infill if maintaining “conventional” or ‘traditional” residential neighborhoods? May be beneficial to know lot size ranges for land uses.	This will be covered by Infill Best Practices discussion in toolbox. Was not high priority of group as a whole.
29	KEllis	9-4-18	Beneficial to see how any proposed changes to land uses would be implemented (before/after map showing zoning changes?) Would it result in the reduction/addition of buildings/roads/impervious areas/open space?	Possibility for future land use alternatives analysis.
30	KEllis	9-4-18	Where did the table of action items come from? Are there none for transportation? Add in what the different letters mean for each goal.	From ideas made throughout subcommittee meetings, with staff and consultant input. The transportation items are in the Mobility section. Letters refer back to original list of goals.
31	LGordon	9-4-18	The way the concept of smaller scale Community “nodes” has changed form: the introduction of large scale regional hubs.	Discussed during Sep 6 Plan Forum meeting.
32	LGordon	9-4-18	Eliminate concept of large scale regional hubs	Discussed during Sep 6 Plan Forum meeting.
33	LGordon	9-4-18	The proposed expansion of multi-family residential throughout most of the land use categories and in new large areas of town.	Discussed during Sep 6 Plan Forum meeting.
34	LGordon	9-4-18	Do not automatically include mixed use and multi-family in the Community Commercial Corridors	Edit made.
35	LGordon	9-4-18	Identify where smaller scale contained neighborhood or community commercial nodes might be needed. Then consider where mixed use/multi-family might be needed/wanted.	Discussed during Sep 6 Plan Forum meeting.
36	LGordon	9-4-18	The prominently stated goal/emphasis on infill....	Discussed during Sep 6 Plan Forum meeting.
37	LGordon	9-4-18	The densities listed in the 5.1 Chart describing criteria for different levels of hubs.	Discussed during Sep 6 Plan Forum meeting.
38	LGordon	9-4-18	Hubs do not need to be added where there are existing hubs and/or sufficient commercial services and existing residential resources.	Discussed during Sep 6 Plan Forum meeting.
39	LGordon	9-4-18	More attention is needed in identifying what already exists; its current size; how its functioning; whether something	Discussed during Sep 6 Plan Forum meeting. This will be subject to a future special area plan.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

			more is actually needed; and a needs assessment done prior to proposing additional hubs.	
40	LGordon	9-4-18	Waterfront areas – Shem Creek needs to be separated with much more protection and clear limits on use.	Edit made to better differentiate the 3 waterfront areas.
41	LGordon	9-4-18	Gateways – much more work needs to be done in defining and protecting what a gateway should be.	Edits made, future potential ordinance amendments.
42	LGordon	9-4-18	The changes in classifications in single family neighborhoods.	Discussed during Sep 6 Plan Forum meeting.
43	MJones	9-4-18	Increase height in commercial areas – NC should be 1-3; Community 1-4; Regional 2-5. Remove 45’height in hubs – add requirement to blend with adjoining area. Heights need to be hub specific.	45’ reference removed. Heights tied to height map and height of adjoining properties.
44	MJones	9-4-18	Impact fees based upon “adequate infrastructure” – define “adequate”.	Adequate is used as a standard to ensure that infrastructure capacity is sufficient or adequate to service the demand. For transportation this is a calculation such as level of service or volume to capacity ratios based on the characteristics of a given roadway. These characteristics typically include number of lanes, speed limit, number of intersections etc.
45	MJones	9-4-18	“Insure transportation infrastructure is in place to meet the needs of the approved development” – suggest striking this to say that impact mitigations are completed in a timely manner.	Edits made.
46	MJones	9-4-18	Patriot’s Point needs to be Regional scale development area.	Edit made to better describe Pat Point area.
47	MJones	9-4-18	Support “Gullah as a way of life”. What does this mean?	
48	MJones	9-4-18	How can we have a rural neighborhood area (Thomas Goodwater) between community facilities and neighborhood scale?	Recommend changing LU to settlement, in conjunction with Ms Ascue’s comment.
49	MJones	9-4-18	Improve the Republic Tract Hub to include public park and water access along with neighborhood hub.	Edits made to Waterfront LU description.
50	Pireland	9-4-18	3-2 Urban Corridor/Overlay Districts: Par. 2, line 4: can we replace “perceptions” with “comments” or “complaints”?	Edits made.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

51	Pireland	9-4-18	3-3 In the definition of Hub (inset), after “walkable”add “and bikeable.”	Edit made.
52	Pireland	9-4-18	3-3Recommendation #2 – A “one-size-fits-all” approach for overlay districts does not work, as experience shows. Each is unique and needs to be addressed individually.	Edit made. Current overlay districts are confusing and contradictory at times. Streamlining would be beneficial for all.
53	Pireland	9-4-18	3-3 Recommendation #3 – Special Area Plans – who would determine and how? Should there be (or are there) proper guidelines for these?	Defined Special Area Plans.
54	Pireland	9-4-18	3-4 Recommendation #6 – Can you explain what’s meant by “context-sensitive development”? This appears in several different sections.	Defined context-sensitive.
55	Pireland	9-4-18	3-4The definition of “Affordable Housing” only includes the housing cost criterion, and “Workforce Housing” definition only addresses eligibility (and does not cover seniors, etc... There should be one term (some towns use the term “Lifecycle Housing”) with a full definition that covers (a) specifying who is eligible to apply (specify categories, or is it anyone who meets the following two criteria?) (b) the eligibility criterion (i.e., household income level) and (c) the housing cost criterion (i.e., x% of household income).	Additional information provided. Edits made.
56	Pireland	9-4-18	3-4 Shouldn’t the above take into account the combined income of those living in the housing? The current language in “Workforce Housing” doesn’t do that.	It is based on household income.
57	Pireland	9-4-18	3-9 Cultural Core - In Recommendation #1, I am wondering if there’s a way to prevent the loss of some of these key properties pending the completion of a joint study and further action, which could take considerable time? (E.g., temporary freeze on subdivision development? special zoning designation? Individual agreements, formal or informal, with the larger property owners (Boone Hall/Hamlin Farms)? Just a thought. May be worth adding a short-term action point to brainstorm ideas.	This will be addressed during special area planning and implementation.
58	Pireland	9-4-18	3-9 Recommendation #2: Suggest deleting “in the core” since the cultural center may not be best situated there (adverse effects on Six Mile Community? Develops part of	Edit made.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

			what we are trying to keep undeveloped?) May as well not address possible location.	
59	Pireland	9-4-18	3-12 Financial Health/Resilience - Recommendation #3, 1st bullet point: This calls for “strengthening the Town’s tax base with an appropriate mix and intensity of residential and non-residential forms for development.” Keeping in mind that the Focus and Community Vision are to protect the character of the existing Town and improve livability protection and planning, what happens when these goals are in conflict? The public has made its priorities clear, so I would add at the end, “to the extent consistent with the Focus and Community Vision stated in Section 5.3 of this Plan.”	We can discuss this with the Plan Forum.
60	Pireland	9-4-18	4-21Transportation - Table 4-5: Shouldn’t item NA2 be deleted, given clear public sentiment that Boone Hall property not be touched? Or is there a modified alignment/extension plan in the works that does not encroach on Boone Hall?	We can discuss this at the next Plan Forum meeting. While public sentiment may prefer and the plan may recommend the continued existence of Boone Hall at low density due diligence must be done in order to understand the impacts and potential solutions if it does develop.
61	Pireland	9-4-18	4-21 As this Plan spans the next 10 years, Wingo Way should be noted as a necessary transportation focus/project. With so many already approved additional hotels, office buildings and apartments along the Ravenel Bridge, as well as the pending large-scale Patriots Point development, Wingo Way will become a major artery from those developments to all areas of Town lying west of US 17, and to the bridge entrance.	Noted. We will examine how Wingo Way functions in modeling scenarios and look for needed improvements.
62	Pireland	9-4-18	5-13 Land Use - The Five Contexts - Recommendation #1: Delete the phrase “to the greatest extent possible” -- it is too subjective and leaves too big an opening.	Edits are being made to clarify and most of this content has been moved to the Appendix.
63	Pireland	9-4-18	5-13 Recommendation #2: Are we suggesting here that we are ok with rezoning properties from one land use type to a “lower” use? This is a problem. Those who bought in one neighborhood type have a reasonable expectation that it	No, that is not what is being recommended.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.
 Updated 9/27/18

			not be changed to one with more density. Actions that would have this effect are ones that citizens do not want, according to the public input.	
64	Pireland	9-4-18	5-13 Recommendation #6 – Again, would like to clarify what context-sensitive development means.	Edit made as above.
65	Pireland	9-4-18	5-13 We should consider whether to add a recommendation restricting future development of non-owner-occupied short-term rentals. If we are going to allow certain commercial areas to add residential units, these should not be snatched up by investors for use as short-term rentals. That would be antithetical to the purpose for which these residential units are being justified.	Town Council is currently reviewing this issue.
66	Pireland	9-4-18	5-15 Land Use – Conventional Residential Neighborhoods - I would delete the phrase “where allowed by Town codes” in the last sentence of paragraph 1, regarding ADUs. The purpose of the Comp Plan is to recommend an approach. That may or may not result in changes to the Town codes. ADUs can change the change the character of existing neighborhoods, by adding density, etc, so I would prefer to make a recommendation that restricts ADUs where it makes sense to do so, regardless what Town codes currently say. (ADUs also are mentioned in Traditional Residential Neighborhoods - this same comment applies there.)	Town Council is currently reviewing this issue.
67	Pireland	9-4-18	5-16+ I still am not sure how to interpret the figures illustrating “typical cross sections” of various street widths. Are these showing what exists currently? The word “typical” suggests there are other possible configurations. We’ve had no discussion about them.	There are many different specific road designs in town, due largely to the standards in place at the time the roads were built. The cross sections exemplify of the type of road segment in those areas – and the appropriate types of roads to build in the future in those areas.
68	Pireland	9-4-18	5-15+ For these land use types (and perhaps for ALL land use categories) we should recite the current maximum lot coverage % (impervious surfaces). Then, I would suggest we consider recommending (slight) decreases in the %, because of the runoff and flood problems resulting from	Not all zoning classifications in the town currently have impervious surface requirements. Runoff from all development is held to a predevelopment rate. To arbitrarily reduce the % coverage would likely render a great number of properties non-conforming.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

			overdevelopment and the disappearance of surfaces that absorb water.	
69	Pireland	9-4-18	5-23 Land Use Types – Activity Center/Community Facilities: - Add “hospitals” to the listing of uses in the first paragraph	Edits made.
70	Pireland	9-4-18	5-20-28 Changing Commercial to Mixed Use by allowing Residential- As written, virtually any redeveloped commercial area could be converted to mixed use.	Edits made.
71	Pireland	9-4-18	5-20-28 Protection of trees, and strengthening landscape buffers and setback requirements, were among the public’s priorities (surveys, open houses) and were stressed in subcommittee 2 of our forum. These need to be added as specific recommendations in the land use section of the Plan. Even though those ideas may be mentioned elsewhere, their emphasis could be diminished unless they are included here too.	Edits made.
72	Pireland	9-4-18	Regional Scale Commercial –I still am grappling with a “Regional” focus. It seems we are trying to draw more people from out of Town into Town, thereby increasing our bridge traffic (which is already horrible). Is this approach necessary for our economic viability? If so, we are ignoring the pleas of our residents and failing to meet the Focus and Community Vision set forth above.	Throughout this process, part of the vision has been to have a fiscally healthy town to enable us to meet the needs/wants of our citizens. Can’t buy open space or build cultural facilities or bike paths without a healthy municipal budget. To do that, a level of economic vitality is essential. Cannot have a healthy economy without areas for commercial/business opportunity.
73	Pireland	9-4-18	Along the same lines, we should discourage additional hotels, by not making them permitted uses in massive areas in all parts of Town	Plan recommendation is that they be focused in Regional Commercial areas. Changes to zoning classifications will be considered at appropriate time.
74	Pireland	9-4-18	If Regional Scale Commercial ends up remaining in the Plan, the same comment applies here as in Community Commercial. We should only allow residential in limited quantities, and only in specific designated areas (not in every Regional Scale area), and only after careful study of the density and traffic that exists in each such area.	Determination would be made during creation of the special area plan which would include careful study of the density and traffic in the area.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028
Icons: house, tree, car

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

75	Pireland	9-4-18	<p>5-28 In an earlier letter, I suggested conditioning the approval of residential infill on making a certain percentage of residential units long-term Lifecycle Housing. If we are going to convert some commercial areas to residential mixed-use, shouldn't we try to "kill two birds with one stone" by also satisfying our need for "affordable" housing? I would like to discuss this possible concept.</p>	<p>Edits made to housing diversity recommendations. Some of this could also be implemented through changes in Town ordinances.</p>
76	Pireland	9-4-18	<p>5-31-34 Hubs – Some of what are referred to throughout the Plan as "hubs" don't fit the following description of a Hub: "[It is] "a concentration of residential, retail, dining and service uses that are available at a neighborhood level and easily walkable from surrounding areas. May be smaller or larger, and have differing design guidelines, based upon the needs, character and requirements of the surrounding area." (page 3-3) "Hubs are commercial and public use destinations where residents can easily have some of their daily needs met, ideally within walking or bicycling distance of where they live. (page 5-31) One purpose is to cut down on car trips by having neighborhood commercial options that are accessible by foot. There are existing hubs around Town, but this draft proposes a number of additional, new Hubs. The proposed Hubs would fit within the boundaries of existing primarily commercial areas. (5- 32)</p> <p>The neighborhood hub concept makes sense and fits the above descriptions. It calls for small commercial businesses within walking distance of those who live in the immediate surrounding neighborhoods, to cut down on car trips. The larger the hub is, though, the less it fits the above descriptions. I think we need to use different terms to differentiate the walkable neighborhood "hubs" concept from the larger congregation of commercial businesses to which the primary or exclusive access is by car. Table 5-1 needs to be modified to address the above issues, and to reduce the recommended densities stated therein (9 units</p>	<p>We will refine the definition on page 3-3 to be consistent with the definition on page 5-31. Emily will look at solutions.</p>

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

			per acre, 16 units per acre) which are too high and run contrary to public sentiment.	
77	Pireland	9-4-18	5-35 There is a reference here to lowering (or providing incentives to offset) the cost of impact fees. While there may be instances when carefully crafted exceptions are possible, sensible and legal, as a whole this seems like a slippery slope. I suggest acknowledging in the Plan the recent decision to increase impact fee sharing percentages, and the reasons cited for that decision. (Where this issue comes up in other sections, this comment applies as well.)	We can further discuss this further in the next group meeting. The balance between physical character and fiscal health.
78	Pireland	9-4-18	Waterfront - Each of these areas is distinct and merits separate consideration and recommendations. Shem Creek, specifically, should not include single family attached and multi-family. We should not leave the door open for possible sale of property along the creek for development of townhomes or condos (or hotels, for that matter). Why is the Ravenel Bridge area not considered Waterfront? It is both a Gateway and Waterfront, with considerable public activity along the pier, etc. See my additional comments under Gateways regarding the bridge area. We should include a recommendation that all Waterfront (re)development be of an appropriate “coastal” character in design, scope, etc.	Waterfront Land Uses have been clarified for Patriots Point, Shem Creek and Republic tract.
79	Pireland	9-4-18	5-41 Gateways and Corridors: Gateways “are intended to give a lasting first impression for visitors” and “frame the Town’s character” for existing residents. (page 5-14) Given that, it’s hard to fathom the continued influx of very tall (in some cases, actual high-rise) building -- apts, condos, offices and hotels – at our major Gateway over the Ravenel Bridge. While the proverbial horse may already be out of the barn, I still think we should be recommending lower heights and a more coastal town feel for this Gateway for future development (and redevelopment). Pretty signage at Gateways is nice, but the structures themselves (and the	Edits made.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

			landscape in general) are what draw the attention. The lasting impression for visitors of the Bridge Gateway is quickly becoming a major cityscape rather than a charming coastal town, and it is not framing the Town’s character in the way our existing residents say they want. Also, Gateways are not the same as Corridors and presumably warrant some different recommendations.	
80	Pireland	9-4-18	Johnnie Dodds District: The notion of adding “residential opportunities” in the Houston Northcutt area concerns me. Redevelopment of existing multi-family areas in that district is fine, but adding more residential units (especially given how many hotel rooms are in this area) will exacerbate traffic and congestion. A “live-work” concept does not achieve the intended goals in a sprawling geographic area like ours without a centralized urban area. And by sticking in residential housing in every commercial area, we are likely failing to meet the Focus and Community Vision noted above.	This will be considered during special area planning for the area.
81	Pireland	9-4-18	What would a Special Area Plan do in the context of Patriots Point? How much (and what kind of) control does the Town have over that development?	Could influence overall design and public access opportunities in the development of the site.
82	Pireland	9-4-18	See my comment earlier about Wingo Way (as a transportation project)	Noted above we can look at it for needed improvements.
83	Pireland	9-4-18	Coleman District Since half of Shem Creek is covered in this district and the other half in the Johnnie Dodds district, their descriptions should be consistent. I’d use the sentence from here to replace the sentence used in Johnnie Dodds District	Edits made.
84	Pireland	9-4-18	Also in the Shem Creek section, we should be specific about protecting dock space for the remaining shrimping fleet, since this is an immediate and growing problem.	Edits made.
85	Pireland	9-4-18	In Recommendations #1 and 2: The reference to 2-3 stories should be changed to 1-2 stories.	Comment noted.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

86	Pireland	9-4-18	What would a Special Area Plan consist of (eg for Ben Sawyer Blvd?	Could address overall design/landscaping/setback criteria? Parking?
87	Pireland	9-4-18	Shouldn't #9 and #10 from the recommendations in the last Open House materials (land use maps) -- i.e., improving bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and integrating public transportation -- be included here too?	Specified in Mobility section. Had been removed from each district due to concerns about it being redundant.
88	Pireland	9-4-18	Towne Centre District In Recommendation #5, change "limiting" to "denying." Also refer to the Cultural Core. Also, recommend historic designation?	Kept "limiting" because there could be appropriate subdivisions within the area – if meets codes, can't categorically "deny". Historic designation covered in the Settlement section and recommendations.
89	Pireland	9-4-18	Long Point District In Recommendation #2, we should be careful about more residential mixed use here (especially multi-family) because of the horrible traffic problems already on Long Point Road and the unacceptability of roadway modifications that could adversely impact Boone Hall or the scenic roadway designation. In Recommendation #3, add the same language as in Towne Centre #5, with my change (denying rezonings for subdivision developments within Snowden Settlement Community). Also, recommend historic designation?	Kept "limiting" because there could be appropriate subdivisions within the area – if meets codes, can't categorically "deny". Historic designation covered in the Settlement section and recommendations.
90	Pireland	9-4-18	Route 17 North District In Recommendation #6, change "limiting" to "denying." Also, recommend historic designation?	As above.
91	Pireland	9-4-18	SC Hwy 41 In Recommendation #3, change "limiting" to "denying." Also, copy text contained in "Areas of Interest – Phillips Community" to create a recommendation #7.	As above.
92	Pireland	9-4-18	Carolina Park/Ten Mile Revise Recommendation #5 to conform to the other settlement community recommendations noted above. See also some of the language under Areas of Interest – Ten Mile Community to add to recommendation #5.	As above. Areas of interest throughout incorporated into recommendations.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.
 Updated 9/27/18

93	Pireland	9-4-18	6-3 Community Action - In the first bullet point (Membership of the Implementation Committee), are the Plan Forum members in addition to, or among, the 10-20 Council-appointed citizens?	Intent is they would be among those appointed
94	Pireland	9-4-18	6-7 We can't identify the goals without a legend explaining the letter codes.	Note added. Letters for goals match the letter at the beginning of the document by the goals.
95	Pireland	9-4-18	6-7Admin Action Point #1: add the same qualifier as in my comments ("to the extent consistent with the Focus and Community Vision set forth in this Plan."	We can discuss in the next group meeting.
96	Pireland	9-4-18	There are several action points for which I would suggest a different priority and or timeframe... I can provide those when we meet. Also, a few action points are problematic (related to my comments earlier)... I don't have adequate time to address those here.	Noted
97	PSullivan	9-4-18	1. introduction, pg 1-4: there seems to be a HUGE jump from our few pages of subcommittee notes to the District Plans for various parts of town.....can you help us understand how this happened?	Discussed in previous meeting on Sept 6 th .
98	PSullivan	9-4-18	2. pg. 3-2: where did the "description" text come from - I don't recall discussions that were this intricate	This came from subcommittee discussion and break out work.
99	PSullivan	9-4-18	4. pg 3-13 : Saying that the Town has established a "good foundation for this in a green network....." - my initial reaction is that this is a huge stretch - football stadiums, tennis courts, Park West Rec center, soccer/volleyball courts are not a green network to me 5. pg. 4-6: include what traffic level each of these roads was built for	Comment noted.
100	PSullivan	9-4-18	6. pg 4-7: please explain the difference between "daily work person trips" & "all other person trips	We will add this to the explanation in the paragraph before the table.
101	PSullivan	9-4-18	7. somewhere in the transportation section.....when addressing "traffic impact" for a new development, please find a way to request that "cumulative" traffic be accounted for	Traffic Impact Analyses do consider the cumulative impact of traffic from all sources with the project in question added on top.
102	PSullivan	9-4-18	8. pg. 4-21: several questions too long to put here	Noted.
103	PSullivan	9-4-18	9. pg 4-24 - some issues with noted recommendations	Noted.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

104	PSullivan	9-4-18	10. pg 4-26 - lots of folks buy off on the concept of connectivity, but when it comes time to use it in their neck of the woods, then they're against it - this needs a VERY strong case for our enforcing connectivity	Comment noted.
105	PSullivan	9-4-18	11. pg. 4-28 - what is an "alternative payment method"?	Will clarify.
106	PSullivan	9-4-18	12. pg 5-8 - map totally unreadable, so what's the point here?	Maps will be improved.
107	PSullivan	9-4-18	13. pg. 5-9: what is the Community Rating System"	Defined in Action Item.
108	PSullivan	9-4-18	14. pg 5-13 - what do you mean by #3 recommendation?	Set a good example with public buildings.
109	PSullivan	9-4-18	15. pg 5-14: pls give infill & redevelopment examples that are ready or near ready	Unclear what is being asked.
110	PSullivan	9-4-18	16. pg 5-16: define "park land", "open space", "passive green space" - it seems that they can be inter-mixed here	Defined.
111	PSullivan	9-4-18	17. pg 5-23 etc. - how did you decide what should go in each land use type	Professional standards and planning practice.
112	PSullivan	9-4-18	18. pg 5-33: what are "green infrastructure design principles"? & how did you decide that the edge of a hub should be no higher than 45'	Defined.
113	BKoedding	9-21-18	3-3 Recommendations – 3: The term “Special Area Plan” is referenced throughout the Plan. There does not appear to be a specific definition of this term prior to its use. Recommendation 3, seems to imply that this will be determined, at a later date, “based upon citizen input”.	Defined.
114	BKoedding	9-21-18	3-4 3.3 Housing Diversity and Affordability. The definition of “affordability” is in line with the HUD definition. The side bar stating “decent, quality housing”, is very subjective and should be further defined or “decent & quality” should be eliminated. Can this be quantified?	Edit made.
115	BKoedding	9-21-18	5-3 Land Use & Community Design: There does not appear to be a legend that reflects unincorporated land in the TOMP. Is this restricted, more or less to the Settlement Communities, Boone Hall and Hamlin Farms? I mention this, due to the recent news report regarding the “Peach Orchard Plaza”, which is under Charleston County jurisdiction. Are there similar parcels within the TOMP?	Not differentiated because all within planning area. We can add a boundary map for reference.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

			Section 3.7 Finance Health/Resilience (page 3-12) refers to “annexation of unincorporated properties” and “donut holes”. Is the Peach Orchard Plaza an example of this?	
116	BKoedding	9-21-18	5-8 Hazard Profile – Description: “As we experienced earlier this year due to a bridge closure”. Change to read, “As we experienced, in May of 2018, due to a bridge closure”	Edits made.
117	BKoedding	9-21-18	5-9 Recommendations – 6: Improve the Community Rating System score. The “CRS” is not defined anywhere in the Plan nor is the current score for the TOMP listed. I assume that this is the FEMA National Flood Insurance Program score. If so, the FEMA definition should be referenced.	Defined in Action Item.
118	BKoedding	9-21-18	5-12 The Five Contexts: What plans does the TOMP have in place for “adaptive reuse” and “redevelopment”? Does this include vacant retail/commercial space in mixed-use areas of town? I’m not aware if vacancy rates in the TOMP are an issue. But it does appear that there are a number of vacant spaces. The K-Mart(?) plaza, at 17 & Bowman, is a good example of adaptive reuse.	We have moved these to the Appendix to be discussed in the Best Practices.
119	BKoedding	9-21-18	5-37 Republic Property Tract. The concept of this being a “waterfront hub” is a good idea. Does the TOMP actually have influence over this site to make this a reality in the future?	Edits made to Waterfront LU description.
120	BKoedding	9-21-18	5-60 SC Highway 41/US Highway 17 Hub. I’ve been actively engaged in the SC Highway 41 project by attending meetings, as well as reviewing the “official” website http://www.hwy41sc.com . This is just a comment, in that I have no idea as to what the concept is regarding the “construction and realignment of the intersection of Highways 41 and 17”. There is already a number of commercial facilities there as well as site preparation being done for more commercial facilities. It would seem that properties would possibly need to be condemned to improve traffic flow at this intersection.	Part of SCDOT existing alternatives study.
121	BKoedding	9-21-18	5-61 Republic Tract Hub – Description: “public access to the SPA-Wando terminal.” What does this mean? The SPA-	Edits made.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

			Wando terminal is a commercial entity. Who would and why would someone want to access the terminal from the Republic Tract Hub?	
122	BKoedding	9-21-18	6-2 6.2 Priority Investment – Short-term Efforts: “consider establishing an Office of Resilience”: The Plan does an adequate job of defining “resilience” and the concept of a “Resilience Plan” is a good idea. However, wouldn't this be somewhat redundant and/or an expansion of the Town's bureaucracy? Certainly a “Resilience Plan” could be implemented and monitored by an existing Department within the TOMP Government.	Edits made.
123	PAscue	9-20-18	Need clarity on definition of Special Area Plan. What are some examples of Special Area Plans in the Mt Pleasant area.	Defined.
124	PAscue	9-20-18	Where are Rural Residential areas on the maps?	Map Legends edited to show.
125	PAscue	9-21-18	However, historically what we (local residents) know The Ten Mile Community is actually both North & South of Highway 17... That’s why I specifically mentioned Tupelo as well as Pepper Plantation Another question to bring clarity to the statement. re: PARTS of Pepper Plantation being Rural Residential 1. If PARTS of Pepper is Rural Residential, what are the remaining portions considered? 2. What is Tupelo characterization? Is this sub/division Rural Residential too?	Recommend changing land use for area north of 17, outside of Planned Developments.
126	PAscue	9-21-18	Saw no mention of Tupelo, Pepper Plantation or Bee’s Landing on the comments section of Community Character page 5-65 Only Carolina Park is mention, within the Ten Mile segment. The areas mentioned above should be documented in this Comp-draft.	All individual communities within the District are not listed in the name but they are included and planned for. We did make map changes to include those areas within the Settlement Communities.
127	PAscue	9-21-18	Do Rural Residential have mixed uses too? And are the guidelines within this current draft?	Yes, in the text.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028
Icons: a house, a tree, and a car.

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

			If it's a fact, how do this works regrading property within the Pepper Plantation and Tupelo Sub/division?	
128	PAscue	9-21-18	Base on the traffic "Mobility Element" segment page 4-6 Based on the current growth and the fact that three (3) other communities isn't being documented (verbally) as part of the Ten Mile Area, it indicates (Community Character-5-65) an impression that growth in this area isn't relevant to what's occurring on the Northern Boundary.	Growth in this area is being considered.
129	PAscue	9-21-18	Hence, based on the Mobility Element page 4-6 from US 17 41 to Fifteen Mile Landing based on the traffic table this area compound annual growth rate 2012-2017 is rated third (3rd) within the graphic ratings As you know I've said in our sub-committee meetings as well as the FULL FORUM a traffic light or a blinker need to be place at Highway 17, Beehive and Tubplo Roads. Since, this is planning for the future of these areas, are ongoing for growth.	As with all intersections in town a signal warrant can be conducted and installed if deemed warranted. This also requires coordination with SCDOT as it is a US Hwy.
130	LGordon	9-21-18	1) Community Scale Hubs instead of Large Scale Regional Hubs. (see attached letter, #1a) Existing Community Scale hubs already contain limited large scale commercial (Oakland, Seaside Farms, Six Mile, Wando Crossing, Belle Hall center, etc..) Creating <i>larger concentrations</i> of large scale commercial (via Regional) would create more of the problems we are trying to contain. Again, I think hubs should be limited to Community Scale. Also hotels and tourist traffic do not need to be further distributed throughout the town, but be contained more near Ravenel Bridge.	Discussed at Plan Forum meeting on Sept 6 th . This will also be considered in the special area plans.
131	LGordon	9-21-18	2) There needs to be a needs assessment re: what, in addition to the Commercial Hubs we <i>already</i> have, is <i>actually needed</i> and <i>where</i>. (See attached,#6) Involving citizens from respective planning areas. What's needed/would be supported? Or not. Our surveys have not	Discussed at Plan Forum meeting on Sept 6 th . This will also be considered in the special area plans.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

			really lent themselves to this and think unwise to superimpose system of hubs without better assessment of needs. And then <i>separately considering which of these</i> needed hubs might warrant additional residential. A subcategory, but not automatic. And not to plan additional mixed use hubs near already existing ones.	
132	LGordon	9-21-18	3) Densities proposed for any mixed use hubs need to be much more moderate. (#4) High density/Urban Corridor 16/acre densities are not needed, if any added residential is warranted; and I think unacceptable to residents. In general there seems to be too much focus on adding additional residential when we are trying to limit that. And a 45' height at the <i>edge</i> would be higher than many adjoining neighborhoods and is higher than the current 40' (abutting) limit in Urban Corridor. Even at that, people are looking down into the windows of existing houses. Heights at the edge should probably be contingent/within a limit of what already exists, if they are to truly blend or be context sensitive.	Discussed at Plan Forum meeting on Sept 6th. This will also be considered in the special area plans.
133	LGordon	9-21-18	4) The prominently stated goal and emphasis on "infill". (see attached letter #3)	Comment noted.
134	LGordon	9-21-18	5) Waterways and Gateways need more protection and work if they are to meet the definitions.(see attached, #7,8).	This will be considered in the special area plans
135	PSullivan	9-21-18	HOUSING AFFORDABILITY QUESTION - pg. 3-5, how can we ensure through the comp plan that all of our issues are not transferred over to the "Housing for All" new non-profit?	Comment noted.
136	PSullivan	9-21-18	2.2 GOALS – have each of these been cross-checked with recommendations further in the plan? Especially 2.2 "A" which was 90%, "E" @94%, "F" @95%, "P" @ 91%, "R" @89%	Yes.
137	PSullivan	9-21-18	2-4 SETTLEMENT COMMUNITIES – pg 3-7, need to add 1. coordinating with Gullah Geechee Corridor Commission, 2. Educate local communities on costs, benefits & process of	Edits made.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

			annexation, 3. Help Gullah Geechee community become economically profitable	
138	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 3-13 – what a good definition of “green network”?	Defined in text.
139	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 3-14 – why aren’t freshwater & saltwater wetlands considered “open space”?	Edits made.
140	PSullivan	9-21-18	4 MOBILITY ELEMENT It’s called the “mobility” element, “mobility plan” etc., yet multiple times throughout this section it is intermixed with “transportation” – doesn’t make sense to have both	Will edit for consistency throughout. Should be mobility element.
141	PSullivan	9-21-18	TABLE 4-1 - Traffic Data of Key Roadways – pg.4-6, please state the capacity the road was built for	Roadways have a given capacity based on criteria such as functional classification, number of lanes and the measured level of service. We can provide the basis for these calculations in the plan or appendix.
142	PSullivan	9-21-18	TABLE 4-2 Projected Change in Travel Patterns – pg. 4-7 – 1. please explain difference between “Daily Work Person Trips” & “All Other Person Trips” & 2. how they were calculated – why the increase in “trips beginning in Mt. P. and end outside Town from 2015 to 2040?	We’ve added additional clarifying language.
143	PSullivan	9-21-18	4.7 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PERFORMANCE Pg. 4-12 – if transportation impact studies were performed for housing developments all along HWY 41, then why do we now have such bad traffic congestion issues & the Town & County want to widen HWY 41?	A primary goal of long range planning is matching the availability of infrastructure with anticipated demand. Traffic Impact Analyses are a tool used to project impacts from a single development. The timing of projects is also dependent on funding availability and prioritization with other needed improvements.
144	PSullivan	9-21-18	Table 4-3 Transportation Goals & Performance Measures - Pg. 4-14 - Goal “N” – bikes & peds (sidewalks) should be separated – it’s VERY misleading to combine at bike lanes are few and far between compared to	Comment noted.
145	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 4-20 - #8 – please define “green infrastructure design guidelines”	Defined.
146	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 4-21 – what is the source of this alignment & widening information?	Existing plans, public outreach and staff analysis.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.

Updated 9/27/18

147	PSullivan	9-21-18	Long Pt. Rd. from HWY 17 to Whipple is a “Scenic Highway” which borders on Boone Hall & Snowden neighborhood – Boone Hall is historic property listed on the National Register of Historic Places – why widen this road to 4 lanes? You’d be destroying historic property & lose all the trees that make it a scenic highway	It’s not committed rather a what if scenario to do due diligence in case the property develops.
148	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 4-23 – Active Traffic Management Strategies – what’s source of these recommendations?....Committee or Staff or both?	Project staff recommendations based on professional practice.
149	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 4-24 – what is the source of LPR widening & frontage road from @ LPR & HWY 17? That is Boone Hall historic property! - What do all the numbers on this map mean?	It’s not committed rather a what if scenario to do due diligence in case the property develops. The numbers are the project IDs from the tables.
150	PSullivan	9-21-18	COMMUNITY CHARACTER 3.1 Network plans recommendations, pg 5-4, #6. Why provide cost of services & infrastructure to <u>new growth in UNINCORPORATED COUNTY & ACROSS JURISDICTION BOUNDARIES</u> where the Town is a service provider	Edits made.
151	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg 5-7 – why can non-contiguous properties receive service if the project complies with the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, provided they sign an affidavit that they will annex when contiguous???	Town Council and MPWW policy allows this.
152	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 5-13 – Agriculture & Forest Character – don’t understand “active commercial potential based on production of the land” – these two concepts are not complementary	Noted.
153	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg 5-1 – what’s the difference between “passive green spaces” and “park land”?	Defined.
154	PSullivan	9-21-18	Traditional Residential Neighborhoods Description – pg. 5-16 through 5-22 – some paragraphs are real descriptions while others state that something such as sidewalks SHOULD be provided (pg. 5-18)	Noted.
155	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 5-19 – Figure 5-5 - Oliver Brown Road – where is this?	Phillips Community