Ms. Sims called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. thanking everyone that was in attendance, as well as those that attended the public meeting the night before. She then asked if there were any public comments.

1. Public Comments

Mr. Phil Berlinsky stated he is the President of the Boatyard Property Owners Association on Shem Creek which consists of all the homes between Geechie dock and Wando dock. He has been president for 20 years, and thinks it has been in existence for a quarter of a century. He
said they have watched many changes over the years, and the one thing that has been consistent is that the Property Owners Association has always had a great relationship with the shrimping industry. He said they are situated a little differently than the other areas that are currently studied. Mr. Berlinsky said he had some very valid concerns about what has not been taken into consideration. He said they are truly concerned about the traffic, however their neighborhood is a little differently situated, in having to deal with Wando and Geechie Dock issues. He said they do not want a big bar or restaurant at the end of their street which is where his children play and his family lives. Mr. Berlinsky said he looked at the preliminary study which was on-line and it revealed that one of the considerations was Haddrell Street, however he submits to the Committee that it goes much deeper than that. There are 11 homes in his association, but getting back to the Wando Dock, you must pass 70 homes where children play and families live. All the rest of the businesses on Shem Creek do not face that same situation in that you do not have to go through a neighborhood to get there. Mr. Berlinsky said they have been proposed with the threat before with beer/wind license at the dry stack marina, and his neighbors get very upset by this proposition. He said he is a trial lawyer and he sees a lot of terrible things. He said he handles a lot of cases and represent a lot of people that have been adversely affected by people with DUI, and in no way would we be agreeable or consider any type of facility at the end of a neighborhood street where people are consuming alcohol and having that type of nightlife. He said they consider is that The Wreck is back there, which is a low key restaurant that is only open a few hours at night and not during the day, and it still poses some traffic problems, but it has been that way for many years. Mr. Berlinsky said they just do not want any changes. He said he had heard that one of the considerations was to annex the docks from Geechie Dock to the rest of the Dock system, and that would be a massive problem for The Boatyard. What would ultimately happen with that because of the parking constraints is that people would park right in their neighborhood and walk down to Geechie dock to connect to the docks. Likewise if we increase the activity at the end of his street with the Wando Dock, the same problems would exist. He said the parking conditions at the Geechie
Dock and the Wando Dock are only there because they are grandfathered in. Mr. Berlinsky submits to the Committee that he does not believe that those parking areas comply with Mount Pleasant Code, they do not comply with lane-aisle width, with all the requirements they would impose on a new business. Mr. Berlinsky said those code regulations were put in place for good reasons – for safety of the public. He said it would turn into a cluster and prevent emergency personnel from getting down there because of the lack of lane-aisle width. He said if they change the use of the property it is their position that the code would need to be complied with and he does not think there is any way that Geechie Dock, which is a very narrow strip, could comply with the code requirements for parking if a facility was put there. He said the only parking that would be left is at the very end where the structure is located would probably only house what is required for employees. Mr. Berlinsky said at the Wando Docks there would be very limited parking and the off-street parking is something that would not sit well with anyone, not only on Haddrell Street and the homes going from Coleman Boulevard to the back, but also to the members of The Old Village. He said when this condition is brought to the attention of all the members of The Old Village, they will have some extreme concerns about it. Mr. Berlinsky said when people start drinking, they avoid primary roads. What happens is they start going back in the neighborhoods to get where they are going. We would in no way be amenable to any facility that would sell alcohol or increase the traffic flow back there. It does not make any sense, nor would it comply with code requirements regarding parking and lane usage.

Jimmy Bagwell, 41 Vincent Drive – grew up on Shem Creek and now he lives there. He has shrimped on Shem Creek. He used to tie up at Wando Dock and buy ice from Bubba Simmons’ uncle at Red’s Ice House, so he knows Shem Creek very well. He said he knows there are opportunities, but he would point out that Shem Creek looks just fine the way it is. He does not think we do not need a lot more commercial development or any type of development on Shem Creek. Mr. Bagwell said there is a rumor now that the people that just bought Waters’ Edge want to build a hotel down there. He thinks that the amount of traffic that Shem Creek is
seeing now should not be increased by much at all. It is crowded on the
weekends and during the week during the tourist season it is very
crowded. He said he agrees with Mr. Berlinsky – those folks that live in
that neighborhood down there need to be protected. Mr. Bagwell said it
is a great neighborhood, but if we develop on the end of Haddrell Street a
restaurant, a boutique hotel, or something to that effect, it will be a great
disservice to that neighborhood. Mr. Bagwell said he understands that
the Town may be pursuing the Wando Dock, and he would
wholeheartedly encourage the Town to do that. Mr. Bagwell said that Mr.
Robertson and Mr. Randall interviewed him about two months ago and
the last question they asked him was what he thought were the greatest
threats to Shem Creek. Mr. Bagwell said first of all, the greatest threat to
Shem Creek is the loss of the shrimp fleet because if we lose them, Shem
Creek is just another creek, and it will not be the same and we need to do
everything we can to keep them. The second thing he mentioned is
development. He said some of the development that has been potentially
discussed down there would adversely affect the Creek and he thinks we
need to really put a handle on the zoning there. He said Mr. Berlinsky said
that some of that property is grandfathered, and he knows it is, but light
industrial could include things like hotels which he does not think is
needed there. He said it needs to be preserved as it is an historic area,
adding that George Washington caught a rowboat at the end of Haddrell
Street when he was on his southern tour right after he became president.
He said President Washington rode from Shem Creek over to the City of
Charleston. He said Jonathan Lucas had a rice mill on the other side of
Shem Creek. He pleaded with the Committee to consider what they are
saying very closely. He said he knows this Committee is very concerned
about the Creek and they will make some great decisions. Mr. Bagwell
said he looked forward to working with the Committee.

Catherine Main, 1968 Oak Tree Lane said she is the Executive Director of
the East Cooper Land Trust. Ms. Main said her interest is to maintain the
existing look of the Creek, particularly with maintaining the existing
seafood industry properties, and permanently protect them. She said she
knows the Town has some interest in some of those properties, but she is
not sure their interest contains permanent protection. Ms. Main said permanent protection through a conservation easement is critical. She said we do not know what the future Town Council will look like with another election coming up and things could change. She said if these properties do not have permanent protection through a conservation easement, it could be a problem for the seafood industry. Ms. Main said she is sensitive to the private property owners that live in that area, but she wanted to remind everyone that it was the seafood industry that was there first, and the private residences have come in around that and she thinks that if they did not want to live near the seafood industry, they might have thought of that before they moved in.

Ms. Sims reminded everyone when speaking, to please speak one at a time so that comments can be accurately captured.

2. Review of Public Meeting

A) Lessons learned

Mr. Lane said the public meeting was lightly attended and he would say in some respects a lot of the things we heard at the meeting were not inconsistent with what was heard from this group at the beginning of the process. A few comments that he came across were extending the boardwalk quite a bit further along the perimeter of the marsh all the way to Patriots Point. Mr. Robertson said and even further up to the Visitor’s Center.

Mr. Lane said there were comments about protecting the seafood industry, and possibly having a kayak launch outside of the area, particularly for those that are going out in the main waterway it may remove some of the conflict. There was a suggestion of extending Mill Street to connect with the Geechie dock, several concerns about the Wando Dock, there was one particular interest in having a water taxi. There was a comment about the zoning needing to be carefully examined. There were some positive response about the idea of a parking shuttle, with the specifics undetermined. Mr. Lane said those were the principle things that he heard.
Mr. Lane said in general terms, there were many maps and comment sheets, and they thought there would be a large turnout, but there were very few people there. He said if the Committee and Town want to create a consensus as we move along, we will need to get more people attending.

Ms. Sims said the next public meeting was on May 21, and asked if everyone could please help get the word out about the meeting. She said the Town spoke with newspapers, spoke with most if not all of the major media networks and several of them covered it. It was on the Town’s social media and website, and only 20 people attended. Ms. Sims asked if anyone had any other ideas or channels that can be utilized that would be appreciated.

Mr. Bennett asked if that session would also be from 5pm to 7pm and Ms. Sims responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Robertson said the consultants gave a shortened version of the presentation that was given to the committee about existing conditions and what we have learned. They also let the last presentation given to the committee run so that people could see a little more detail and reminded them that the report is on the Town’s website so they could read the entire presentation. He said it might have been a little misunderstood that we had a plan formulated because all they were doing was presenting what was learned and getting ideas for moving ahead. Mr. Robertson said they have developed about 25 opportunities to present to the Committee, and what was learned last night can be added as well.

Mr. Robertson said the opportunities report was e-mailed to the Committee and would be placed on the website. Ms. Sims said it would be added after it was presented to the Committee.

Mr. Robertson said this is going to be a brief presentation of the things the Committee had already seen.
Mr. Robertson reviewed the Mission Statement.

Mission

Preserve, promote, and protect the unique history, nature, and economy of the Shem Creek Study Area and maintain the character of its working creek.
Next, Mr. Robertson reviewed the Study Elements, stating those would be used to organize the opportunities. He said the baseline issues were addressed in December and January, and we are working on opportunities currently, and in the next few months, we will be looking at ideas, choices, future scenarios in draft form in May, and then the final plan in June and early July. That would be the recommendations that go to Town Council.
Mr. Robertson showed the list of opportunities and Mr. Lane would describe the sheets in front of the Committee members and give instructions.

Mr. Lane said they took the idea of opportunities very literally and identified a series of them. Some of them are mutually exclusive, some are not compatible one with the other, but the team thought the best way to think through it is to speculate ways that this could go. He said it is very important to emphasize that what the Committee has in front of them is by no means a plan at all, but it is a bunch of pieces supplemented by other pieces based on discussion and the team’s thinking that might assemble themselves into a plan. Mr. Lane said that the team would present every one of these alternatives, and highlight what is important. Mr. Lane asked the Committee to look at the column marked initial reactions and there are three choices. “Can Support,” “Couldn’t Live With,” and “Oppose.” He said they would take into account the results of these reactions and take that into account as we move forward to figure out how these things live compatibly with one another. Mr. Lane asked them to do this as we go along.
Mr. Robertson said he would now go over Shem Creek Use and Maintenance, which is SC-1 Channel Maintenance, Preservation (slide below).

Shem Creek Use and Maintenance
SC-1 Channel Maintenance, Preservation

Advantages
• Keeping the channel clear
• Increasing safety of boaters embarking and disembarking
• Lessening inconvenience for embarking and disembarking of blocked-in boats

Disadvantages
• Boating visitors excluded the limit would seek dockage elsewhere
• Possible discouragement of boaters attending bars and restaurants

Mr. Robertson said the fleet is very important because they are what causes the Army Corps of Engineers to be able to spend federal money to dredge the channel, and the dredged channel supports the fleet.

Mr. Thomas said we keep using the word fleet and asked if the consulting team had done anything to describe how many jobs and vessels as well as the economic impact they provide.

Mr. Hartling said it appears that there were 11 vessels operating when the Geechie dock was being partially reconstructed. There are some vessels that are only there sometimes. In theory, the owner of the Geechie dock said they can handle 9 boats, and he believes there are others interested in coming. He suspects there are 15-20 vessels. In terms of employment, the individual boats have 3-4 people working on them.

Mr. Thomas said other than quantifying the vessels, nothing has been
done to quantify the number of people employed or the revenue these boats generate.

Mr. Hartling the revenue generated by the boats has not been quantified. The number of people is fewer than 100, but more than 25. It varies from season to season.

Mr. Randall said the team has also looked at the seafood industry immediately in the area. Mr. Hartling said at least 3 of the operations generate other employment in retail and wholesale operations. Many of the vessels sell from the boat.

Mr. Robertson said that information is in the inventory report in pretty much the same detail. Mr. Robertson said one advantage of Channel Maintenance and Preservation is keeping the channel clear and the preservation of that – the channel is 90 feet wide at a minimum up to 130 feet wide and extends from the bridge into the Mount Pleasant Channel. It is 10 feet deep and in the last few years has had maintenance dredging done. Other advantages are increasing the safety of boaters embarking and disembarking and lessening the inconvenience for embarking and disembarking of blocked-in boats. There may be some disadvantages such as boating visitors may be excluded by the rafting limit and would go elsewhere.
Mr. Robertson said if the channel were drawn out on the map of the planning area in a simplified fashion, it would look like what is on the map. Mr. Robertson pointed out the authorized channel with a 10 foot channel, 120, 130 and then 90 feet up to the bridge. He said right now, floating dock to floating dock, the distance across there varies from 127 feet to 157 feet, so on the average it is 130 feet, which then with a 90 foot channel leaves 40 feet left, 20 feet on either side, which is about enough to raft two boats deep and still keep the authorized channel clear. He said that would be different than what occurs on peak times now, and those people that have no place to park their boat to get to the restaurants and bars might want to go somewhere else.

Mr. Robertson said that maintaining the channel and preserving it would be an opportunity he would like the Committee to vote on.

Mr. Barnwell asked if we could clarify that the rafting restriction is for pleasure craft, not the shrimp boats.

Mr. Robertson said they did not make a distinction because the authorized channel is the authorized channel that is supposed to be kept clear. There should be room to raft a sufficient number of boats, but if we need to set some limit on that, it could be considered. The
opportunity that is being presented is to keep the authorized channel clear of parked boats. Mr. Barnwell clarified that was 20 feet on each side and Mr. Robertson responded in the affirmative and said in the commercial area it is a little wider so that might make a difference.

Mr. Robertson said the next thought is adding some additional docks along the side.

Mr. Robertson said there is an opportunity on the north side of the creek to fill in a space between some existing floating docks. He said it might need to be dredged. Mr. Robertson said they learned there may be some concerns with using those floating docks as it is shallow on the marsh side, and the dredging is only done on the channel side, so there might be some minimal work needed to make them useful for pleasure craft that would give some additional space for boats to tie up. Mr. Robertson said the so-called “orphan fleet” of the shrimpers do use the north side of the creek as overflow area. There is another opportunity to extend the boardwalk into the Lucasville area and install some floating docks there so there would be a continuous way to get any boats that might have wanted to raft in front of those restaurants might be spread out along the creek and walk down under the Coleman

Shem Creek Use and Maintenance
SC-3 Adding Floating Docks Along Creek

Advantages
• Completion of connections along docks and boardwalks in Shem Creek Park
• Additional tie-up space for small craft and non-powered vessels
• Additional overflow “parking space” for restaurant patrons
• Additional embarking/disembarking spaces useful at all tides

Disadvantages
• Cost of floating docks and lack of supporting revenue stream

Mr. Robertson said there is an opportunity on the north side of the creek to fill in a space between some existing floating docks. He said it might need to be dredged. Mr. Robertson said they learned there may be some concerns with using those floating docks as it is shallow on the marsh side, and the dredging is only done on the channel side, so there might be some minimal work needed to make them useful for pleasure craft that would give some additional space for boats to tie up. Mr. Robertson said the so-called “orphan fleet” of the shrimpers do use the north side of the creek as overflow area. There is another opportunity to extend the boardwalk into the Lucasville area and install some floating docks there so there would be a continuous way to get any boats that might have wanted to raft in front of those restaurants might be spread out along the creek and walk down under the Coleman
Boulevard Bridge. He said this alternative would complete some connections along the docks and provide some additional tie-up space for restaurant patrons and would also make it easier for people to embark and disembark. Mr. Robertson said there are some disadvantages as that is a costly opportunity and we would need weigh the benefits from that as there is a lack of supporting revenue stream. 

Mr. Barnwell said if you boat that area on that side of the creek it is extremely shallow, and you would be accomplishing nothing putting floating docks in that area. You will not be able to dredge it with federal funds because the fleet goes up there.

Mr. Randall asked if it is just that side, because there are obviously deep water docks on the south side and all the way up the creek.

Mr. Barnwell said that particular area between that and the dock at Shem Creek Bar and Grill is very shallow.

Mr. Simmons said he would caution where the town floating docks are for day boaters – from that section to where it would connect to where the shrimp dock is – that area, although it is a good area to add floating docks, he would say it needs to be recreational only because there is no parking to support businesses on that side further down. He said they probably would not want to walk the distance. It would be good for recreational and would help with some of the rafting issues.

Mr. Randall asked if the new public dock is regulated by a certain kind of time.

Mr. Simmons said park hours and no overnight. Ms. Woods-Flowers added that it is not monitored or enforced.

Ms. Woods-Flowers referred to the triangle on the map and stated that is not where people are fishing from now if you are talking about adding floating docks. It is heavily used by people who are going down there for recreational fishing and she would not want that harmed in any way.

Mr. Simmons said during the summertime it is filled with day boaters and they work together on the concrete floaters.
Mr. Randall asked if they go to the mouth of the channel and Mr. Simmons said it is pretty close.

Mr. Randall said so there is some area at the end where people can fish.

Ms. Anderegg said it is about a tenth of a mile from the floaters to the end.

Mr. Randall said there is a comment section and Mr. Robertson said if ideas want to be added that could be done as well.

Mr. Robertson said next we would look at regional connections that provide a way to get to the Shem Creek area without a car.

Mr. Robertson pointed out the study area, the end of the bridge, the Visitor’s center, the Waterfront Park and Patriots Point. He said there are several designated bike trails that come through the planning area. One is the Battery to the Beach Route, and it is also part of the East Coast Greenway which sooner or later will have a greenway the whole east coast of the United States. He said Coleman Boulevard may not be the easiest place to bike, though it does have bike lanes on it. Mr. Robertson said there are also some lesser designated bike connections.
according to the bike/ped plan for the Town. He said there are also some opportunities for additional trails that might be connected to various spots. Someone mentioned a water taxi and that is in the bike/ped plan, with a possibility of a water taxi stop at the mouth of the gazebo at the end across from Haddrell’s Point and another at Patriots Point, and perhaps one at the Visitor’s Center. Mr. Robertson said last night someone suggested that there be a plan that there would be a boardwalk or esplanade that would go along the waterfront connecting Shem Creek, which would be a good regional connection, but very costly. Mr. Robertson said the Broadway area is outside the study area, but if one wanted to connect that trail to the Shem Creek trail system, there would be a way to do that if you went directly across Lansing Drive and go down to the trail head for the system. It has also been suggested that the Broadway area is subject to redevelopment as it is in the corridor for Coleman Boulevard. If that were to be the case, that trail system may take the form of a waterfront walkway either on the ground or on structuring in front of it as an amenity if it were coordinated with some sort of development, and that would lead in to the study area from that direction. The idea is to create regional connections for people to get to the study area without having to drive. Mr. Robertson reviewed Public Access from the South Central Waterfront Walkway.
Mr. Robertson said this is an opportunity for public access to have a walkway along the waterfront in the south-central area, in the urban creek. He said the Town has done a really nice job of having a public walkway and private uses together on the north side of the creek, but once you get up to Coleman Boulevard it stops. There is a pedestrian walkway that is under construction now to cross over the creek and extend down to the sidewalk which ends at 111 Coleman Boulevard. He said there is really no way for the public to access these businesses that are along there. The only way to get there is to drive and park in the designated parking lot for each business, so one of the goals is to have public access along the waterfront. Mr. Robertson said there is not an easy way to do that as most of the businesses front right on the critical line. The thought was what would happen if those things were wiped out by a disaster, and to dream a little further out, it would be desirable to have a 15-foot strip along there that would be a public walkway in front and allow access from one business to another or even for the pedestrian to go by. That may never happen, but as a goal if the scale of the buildings can be maintained in a rebuild situation, then the idea would be to have public access along there.
Mr. Robertson said it would be hard to implement that piecemeal. Mr. Barnwell asked for clarification on the south-central waterfront walkway, the south east waterfront walkway. Mr. Robertson pointed to the areas on the map.

Mr. Randall said they also discussed that if the south side was mirrored to reflect what was done on the north side, the creek will be narrowed. He said that if things were wiped out, there may be ways to reduce the setback for the Town if public access is provided in the front. The building could still have outdoor seating and dock space.

Mr. Simmons said in fairness the channel does lean more toward the Water’s Edge side. Mr. Bennett said it is the same above the bridge as well.

Mr. Thomas asked if the team had identified what prohibits or restricts the walkway that is being done across Shem Creek when it comes in on the Tavern and Table side to connect all the way down to Saltwater Cowboys. He asked if that is a function of private ownership or the project being massively expensive. Mr. Robertson said he does not have an answer yet, but one of these opportunities does address that and he would get to that shortly.
Mr. Robertson said if you look at public access along the waterway further to the northeast, the notion is to make the walkway to go from grade-level maybe with a connection along Coleman Boulevard down to the ground because where the walkway comes across the new bridge, it will be at sidewalk level which is elevated. He said there would need to be a switch back to come off of the sidewalk to get back down to grade. He said the idea would be to go under the bridge and have the walkway connect to one or two existing publicly owned strips. Mr. Robertson said there may be some encroachments that may need to be cleared up but at the end of Lucas Street there is a public right of way that goes all the way down to the creek, and there is a small 10 foot wide passageway at the end of Scott Street. If that boardwalk were to be placed along there, that would allow connectivity from all of the businesses on the south side of the creek, including those on both the north and south side of Coleman Boulevard. Mr. Robertson said right now, a pedestrian getting from one side to the other has to take his life in his hands or go to the traffic signal which might not be convenient. He said this is a project that the Town had in about 1997 and was actually an approved project to go under the bridge and connect to the sidewalks so there would be a pedestrian crossing that would be grade separated and by going under the bridge pedestrians would not need to cross the street. Mr. Robertson said that project was going to be funded by the state and ultimately OCRM denied the permit as there were some objections to the permit. He said it was still something worth considering. This would be a fixed walkway, and some of the things we are discussing, if they were connected together would form a way to experience the Shem Creek area on foot so that one could park a car and not have to move it to go from one location to another. That is probably a long-term idea, and there is some expense involved with it, but it would create a new network of transportation on foot.

Mr. Robertson said the next slide is about a potential south-central walkway on the landside of the restaurants.
Mr. Robertson said as a fallback to having a walkway on the creek, there may be a way to have a walkway through the parking lots from the edge of Coleman Boulevard to what would be a boardwalk along the existing marshlands and possibly connect to the end of Mill Street. He said this would allow the public to walk or bike along an easement area that would be positioned in a way that would not be intrusive on the parking lots. Mr. Robertson said this would require the businesses to have some sort of cooperative agreement which is not the case right now, which could make it challenging to do. Ultimately if a way for shared parking could be worked out, that could be a real benefit because right now if you want to go from one of those businesses to another, you have to get in your car and move it.

Mr. Randall said with Saltwater Cowboys you have to walk all the way around because of the fence.

Mr. Robertson said that might be a way to get public access and connectivity on a pedestrian route without having to tackle the issue of an extensive boardwalk along the creek.

Mr. Robertson said the next slide is about connection to the Geechie Dock.
Mr. Robertson said a third idea about walkways in that area would be extension of a walkway to the Geechie dock area, which goes along with seafood marketing which would be discussed later in the meeting. He said the idea is to come from wherever the interim walkway or the one along the creek itself were to terminate at the dead-end at Mill Street, it would be a very nice way to connect to the neighborhood on Haddrell Street if you could find a way to have a public walkway through there. It is pretty narrow and it might be hard to find a route that would work. If all of those things were done you would essentially have a complete pedestrian network throughout the whole study area. Mr. Robertson said there are some disadvantages because that would perhaps cause people to overflow into the neighborhood to park and walk, and there was also an idea that maybe the connection across the marsh might be a street instead of a walkway and that might be a way to produce another way for commercial activities to get to the Geechie Dock without having to go through the residential neighborhood. He said that is not what is being proposed so far, but that would be a sub-option.

Mr. Randall said after speaking with a few people at the meeting the
previous night if a concern is additional public access to the residential neighborhoods, a comment could be put in that it could be lived with as a potential support to getting to the Geechie dock and the seafood distribution and sales, and limit access to the neighborhoods.

Mr. Randall said one of the requests was to do a more in-depth parking study, so information was taken from another consultant the Town hired to do a parking study on Coleman Boulevard which included portions of the study area. He said the Consultants went out and did manual counts and at least for the urban part of the creek a parcel study was done. The above slide breaks down the information.
Mr. Randall said Zone 1 one is the Shem Creek Inn and Vickery’s area, including the Town park. By the Town developing the park it actually had a lot of public spaces that end up serving some of the other uses. The Town has a range for parking. The square foot numbers were mostly taken from the report and cross-checked with some areas on Google Earth. The range is from one for 200 square feet of office, and two for one hundred square feet, or one for fifty square feet of restaurant space. Mr. Randall said on the Shem Creek Inn side, 325 spaces were counted and that is above the minimum requirements, but significantly below the maximum, and this area is one that has the most amount of parking per space required. He said Zone 2 is across the street where Saltwater Cowboys, RBs, Tavern and Table and Red’s as well as the new office building are located. Mr. Randall said the new office building provides 234 spaces, and even with 647 spaces provided, although that is slightly over the minimum required by the Town it is significantly under the maximum. Across Coleman Boulevard is where there is a significant shortfall of parking spaces with the office buildings and The Shelter. There are private parking agreements to try
and handle the parking, but as an area for what is there, there are 93 spaces in that area, and the minimum should be 165, with potentially a maximum of 273. Mr. Randall said Zone 4 is Shem Creek Bar and Grill and the other commercial buildings that include some rental facilities. He said they looked at the commercial office space where there are some different uses in there as well, but it is significantly underparked for the minimum required.

Mr. Lane said on that side of the creek there is about half of the minimum required, and that does not take any account of the Outfitter parking or the Shem Creek Marina. He said one of the things that really came across to the consulting team when thinking about the future is how acute the parking situation is in Lucasville.

Ms. Anderegg said in Zone 4, they are missing Coastal Expeditions and Mill Street Tavern. Mr. Randall said they did not go into every business and look at their size. He said he believes the Shem Creek Bar and Grill had an arrangement with Mill Street Tavern for the overall square footage and they did not increase it because of the parking.

Mr. Harling said they found sales in that area for parking lots that are approaching $2M an acre.

Mr. Robertson said this does not include any transient people such as parking for Outfitters, parking of trailers and vessels in the area nor does it include the excursion vessels.

Mr. Lane said the reason is there is no Town specified standard for that so they compared it to the Town minimum requirements. Mr. Robertson said it is worse than the figures show.

Mr. Barnwell stated in Zone 1 it shows the Town of Mount Pleasant and he assumes that is the boardwalk. Mr. Randall said that is parking for the boardwalk and parking on Shrimp Boat Lane. Mr. Barnwell said the minimum required is 18 spaces and asked the length of the dock. Mr. Randall said there is no standard for parks for the Town so they had to go by the County, based on square footage for parks. He said he did not think they looked at the number of boats that could dock specifically.
Ms. Woods-Flowers said there is a sign that says parking there is for people going to the park, but there is no enforcement and people are using that parking to go to the restaurants. Mr. Barnwell said if it were a private marina the parking would be five times that.

Mr. Barnwell said that area is underparked by 230 spaces and the consultants said the dry stack, the Outfitters, Mill Street Tavern are not included, but the other side of the creek, half of the 50 spaces is for the hotel, but the pressure that is created for only having eighteen spaces for public parking, if it were only used for public parking for that dock, it would still be underparked.

Mr. Randall said he agreed eighteen spaces at peak time is not enough to accommodate all the people that are using the public walkway and dock.

Mr. Robertson said those people are probably not just going to go to the park, they will go somewhere else as well.

Mr. Hartling said one of the few rules of life he has found to be inherently true is that people are cheap. It especially applies when it
comes to the option to have to park your car when you come to a location. He said it is pretty obvious that people want to find a place to park for free in a place where they should park, then where can they park for free in a place they should not park, and then where is the paid parking, what is the cheapest place to park. Mr. Hartling said you are seeing it here. There is a garage where people can pay to park, but it is the last place people will park because they do not want to pay. He said there is spillover into the neighborhoods because though they are not supposed to park there, it is free. The people have that have had to face this problem have tried to deal with it through pricing, and that is to encourage people to park where you want them to park with the kind of people they are – meaning how long are they going to stay, are they customers, are they employees, random visitors. The problem we have when there is a dispersed parking lot ownership is how do you impose a consistent pricing system to try to encourage the kind of behavior you want. Mr. Hartling said now with Uber and Lyft options, taking those, or riding a bike and not getting in the car also becomes a price-based option provided it is not totally free to park. He said most people are arriving assuming they will find somewhere to park for free. Mr. Harling said one of the ways to resolve this is by having a communal parking mechanism. That can be done through an authority or through a non-profit. He said the crucial issue when it comes to private ownership of land is people committing the parking spaces they own to the communal system, but they do not want to give up their development rights, or the uncertainty of what happens if the communal parking does not work. There are two mechanisms. One is the commitment of the property is through a rolling two year lease, so as soon as someone reaches a point where they want to do something with their property, they announce they are getting out of it. He said that gives people an opportunity to be in a “now” basis and not a “forever” basis. Mr. Hartling said the second mechanism is to figure out how valuable each person’s property is, and that leads to two ways to make it. One is to take a share of the profits or they get a certain amount of free parking which they can give to their customers. It is getting easier to do that with the apps that are on cell phones for
parking. There is something similar to this at the City Marina on the Ashley River where the commercial businesses within that parking area use a sticker or a stamp to get out, and everyone else must pay. Mr. Hartling said the notion here is to try to put together some type of communal, probably a non-profit parking system and try to rationalize pricing for it. As soon as you go into this paid parking situation, the adjacent residential neighborhoods must be immediately protected with permit parking, and very limited parking for non-permitted people, except for guests, which could use a guest card on the dashboard of the car.

Mr. Robertson said the whole concept assumes that everyone must pay for parking because if there is a free option, that is what people are going to use.

Mr. Hartling said within the system everyone pays, but the pricing could be adjusted for the objectives. For instance, if it is a customer at a restaurant and parking is free for two hours, or something like that.

Mr. Robertson said every restaurant will have to absorb that. Ms. Woods-Flowers said that would not work at the public park because someone that is going to the public park is not going to get that free discount. Mr. Lane said it could through parking meters, but if you are going to put a price on parking, you must price everything in the area. He said to implement something like this probably beyond the scope of what the consultants can do because it is complicated, but there are many ways to figure out how to collect money. He said there is no way people are going to pay a very modest fee to park in the garage when they can park for free outside of it.

Mr. Robertson said there needs to be a sliding scale so you pay more for parking that is a premium location, like right in front of the door, and the garage should be less expensive.

Mr. Lane said many of the spaces in the garage are marked assigned for occupants but only during working hours during the day and not on the weekend.
Mr. Randall said the Town just looked at permit parking which would need to go with the central parking system, but this committee found and the conclusion the consultant came to was that although that would minimize overflow parking in neighborhoods, it is expensive to enforce, there is a need for signage that may not be aesthetically pleasing to the neighborhood and there could be an issue for guests and short term renters. He said the biggest plus from the central parking system is that it will encourage employees and the long term users to park remotely. The first two hours could potentially be given for free and if visitors stay longer than that, the price will go up incrementally every hour, so you do not have people taking up these spaces and then going out on fishing charters or going on kayak excursions.

Mr. Hartling said the owner of the garage said that all but a few spaces are used 8-5 for office personnel, but he only has about 40 for evening use for the office so all the rest are available.

Mr. Robertson said that in the Kimley Horn study it was noted that the price to park in the garage is three times what it is to park in downtown Charleston.

---

### Parking

**P-2 Residential Parking Permit Program**

- Residents are issued a limited number of permits per household. The permit price can vary from no charge to $20 per permit per year or more.
- The number of permits issued can vary based on resident demand and lot frontage size/parking area within the permit zone.
- The price for the permits is normally based on whether or not the municipality wishes to recoup the cost of the program (signage, permits, and/or enforcement) from the residents.
- Short-term visitors are often accommodated by allowing for up to two hours of free parking without a permit.

#### Advantages
- Minimizes overflow parking in residential neighborhoods

#### Disadvantages
- Cost to implement and enforce
- Need for signage that may not be aesthetically pleasing
- Guests of residents and short term renters without off street parking may be inconvenienced
Mr. Hartling said that in the end if it is a user that has particular reasons they need to keep spaces available for an office use, they can provide them only at certain times, or certain portions at certain times, so the level of participation can be manipulated.

Mr. Randall said the garage is currently mostly utilized by the businesses that are severely underparked like The Shelter and Nico, and some offer valet services so they use the parking garage for the valet service.

Mr. Robertson said there are areas identified in the Kimley Horn Study from a week of observations in January, and there was overflow parking everywhere and that is not even peak season.

Mr. Randall said the P-3 slide addresses remote lots and shuttles for employees and excursion patrons. He said this has potential for long term users and employees and would free up spaces for customers. Disadvantages would be startup operation and expenses, and possible conflicts with primary users at remote lots. Town Hall was considered as a remote location during non-business hours. Patriots Point is
another thought, as well as Mount Pleasant Waterfront Park.

Mr. Robertson said the extra parking in the front part of Moultrie Plaza as well as weekend use of middle school parking are also potential options. The reason these are mentioned is they would be an inexpensive way to test to see if it would work as no new parking would need to be developed. There could just be some rules put in for employees and excursion parking. It could be tested out with a shuttle during peak hours, and if it were to look promising, it could be made more formal and possibly develop a new parking lot.

Mr. Barnwell said there have been studies done and people will take a shuttle to work, but they do not want to take one to go have a meal.

Mr. Robertson said it would have to be employees or customers on excursions that would be gone for longer than two hours. He said Town Hall and Patriots Point were probably too far.

Ms. Woods-Flowers said Moultrie Plaza allows trailer parking on the weekends. Mr. Robertson said there are about 21 spaces assigned for boat trailers.

Mr. Barnwell asked if there was discussion about a partnership to build a garage that is closer to Lucasville. Mr. Robertson said they were getting to that. He said if Town Hall were to be considered for parking, there would be a possibility of having a connection through the SCE&G land.
Mr. Lane said they looked at Wando Dock for a couple of reasons. What has been talked about is that the site could possibly be under agreement for private sale and there has been discussion of public purchase. He said they are trying to consider some strategic ways to consider the property. In the slide above the blue buildings are operated by Tarvin, the white buildings are used for seafood processing, and the purple buildings are operated by a construction firm. Next to it is another restaurant, The Wreck, and then residential property immediately abutting. He said there are many requirements in terms of setbacks and buffers. There is property zoned Light Industrial and is within the Waterfront Overlay District. Mr. Lane said they tried to think of possible outcomes for the Wando Dock for the current situation.
Mr. Lane said one possible outcome is if the land is sold privately. Although there has been some discussion about residential here, that is not permissible under the current zoning, and they tried to think of what would be permissible. Mr. Lane said under the Waterfront Overlay District, the zoning does permit any uses that are allowed under the Marine District, and that includes a boutique hotel and restaurants. He said the biggest constraint for this property which is slightly under an acre is parking. It has access from the end of Haddrell street and there are some buffer and setbacks that would apply. Mr. Lane said at the extreme, a 4500 – 5000 square foot restaurant could be accommodated. One of the advantages to making it a restaurant that would make it very valuable is there is a lot of dock space here. Mr. Lane said the biggest advantage is the fantastic view of the harbor. Mr. Lane said they are not going to advocate for any of these options, they just want to convey possible outcomes. Mr. Lane said there is a question of whether it would warrant the kind of numbers that are being thrown around for the purchase, and the advantages of private development is there are no public funds required. The disadvantages are loss of the fishing industry and the diminishment of the working
creek, potential addition of traffic to a dead-end street in a mostly residential area and risk of overflow parking on local streets.

Ms. Canon said there is a text amendment that has had first reading at Council and will be finalized in April which would allow residential above commercial in all of the commercial zoning districts including Light Industrial. She said right now as a conditional use there could be multi-family over commercial, but you cannot have one and two family over commercial, so this text amendment fixes that, but it includes the Light Industrial Zoning District. So residential would be allowed over commercial if it met all the conditions in the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Woods-Flowers asked what precipitated that change. Ms. Canon said in 2014 when the Town adopted the Principal Use Table, the wording was a combination of residential is allowed over commercial, and it only included multi-family over commercial. Ms. Canon said that eliminated the ability to put a one and two family unit over commercial, but there could be three or more.

Mr. Lane said the two that are enabled by the Waterfront Overlay are restaurant and boutique hotel, and those are the only two things that are specifically mentioned.

Mr. Martschink asked if the Marine District zoning allow that. Ms. Canon said she did not have her zoning code with her and would have to check on that.

Mr. Martschink said given the comments received he does not think there is any support for a restaurant in that location, or a hotel. He said for it to be a working creek it needs to be a marine-related use.

Mr. Lane said he understands, but what he is trying to put on the table is what is allowed as it stands right now.

Mr. Hartling said that if something is highly economic and might be allowed, then we would have to do more than say we recommend it, we have to say we do not recommend.

Mr. Robertson said theoretically this could happen.

Mr. Lane said that one reason he titled it private development not
restaurant development is that in thinking about this site, there are three scenarios: totally private development, totally public development or public/private partnership of some kind and he tried to illustrate all three.

Ms. Anderegg asked if it became a yacht club that could park their boats there, then there would not be the ability to keep the creek dredged.

Mr. Lane said this is the outer part of the dredging area, so he thinks they would dredge the channel.

Mr. Barnwell said the idea of a yacht club was already put out there and it was shut down for the residents, as they are adamantly opposed to any type of situation that serves alcohol.

Ms. Woods-Flowers said there would be a parking issue as well.

Mr. Randall said it is important to take into account what the residents are going to support. Even though something may be allowed through zoning, it might not be economically feasible.
Mr. Lane said his next thought was what could be the use if the Town purchased it. The consultants discussed the idea that the Town might lease back the structures to the current operators to maintain fishing operations. Mr. Lane said the white structures might be modified or modernized. There has been discussion about an interpretive center or someplace to talk about the history of the creek, and it might be possible to put something public on it. Possibly a small park or a small structure where there could be interpretive material on the history of the creek and maybe even a shrimp boat which could be used as an exhibit so that people could go inside of it to see how they work. He said it might even be possible to put a walkway and viewing platform so people can look at the fishing operations without intruding on the pier. It would involve a small structure, modest parking, continuing operations of the fishing. The advantages and disadvantages are listed on the W-2 slide above.

Mr. Lane said the third option is Public-Private Partnership. The option illustrated here is retaining the existing fishing operation and putting a much smaller restaurant with the idea that it could create some
revenue to subsidize some of the cost of the purchase. There was discussion that this site could be residential, but that is not shown because it is not zoned for that. Mr. Lane said if there are improvements to the Wando Dock and retain it as part of the working waterfront, there is the possibility that it would be a venue for an ice facility and services.

Fishing Industry Support
F-1 Improvement to Wando Dock

Advantages
• Retention of shrimping and fishing activities
• Expansion of existing dock for working waterfront activities
• Potential to increase dockage space to handle additional boats

Disadvantages
• Cost of dock refurbishment and enlargement

F-2 Ice Facility and Service

Advantages
• Retention of shrimping and fishing activities
• Essential to attract more commercial fishing users
• Efficiencies of shared ice production facilities
• Operation efficiencies for location near fuel dock

Disadvantages
• High cost of central ice plant
• Ongoing operation and maintenance complexities

Mr. Robertson said there is a possibility of extending that dock by about fifty feet at a somewhat modest cost and possibly one or two more boats could tie up there.

Mr. Hartling said it seems clear to him that the technically most efficient and reasonable way to get ice is to replicate what the operators are doing right now which are two 2-1/2 ton ice machines over a freezer box that retains the ice. There are examples of multiple people operating those, and examples of individuals with them. He said it is not very expensive, and other than wiring and plumbing, which would vary by location, this is a $40-$50,000 piece of equipment that is good enough for two or three of the smaller operators. Mr. Hartling said there is history of people trying to do these things collaboratively,
and it has to be the right people that are able to divide up the ice production equally. He said it is possible that in order to do this there may have to be some ice business created that actually sells ice. He said with the current size of the fleet four or five of these type facilities could produce enough ice. He said that may require public collaboration on one or two of these.

Mr. Simmons said that extending that pier at the end of the Wando Dock, if a larger scale operation was put there, it is very noisy and if residents do not want alcohol, he is certain they will not want to hear an ice machine dropping ice at three in the morning, so the smaller machines do make sense.

Mr. Hartling said he has been told that there may be one appearing on that dock of the 2-1/2 ton size.

Mr. Simmons said when Phase 2 was being built they had a discussion and more dock space was offered so that a machine could be put in. Mr. Simmons said at the time he had one of the big ice suppliers fly in, and he wanted to know what an ice plant costs to which Mr. Simmons replied over a million dollars for decent ice supply. The supplier said that Cummins Ice is getting ready to update their plant and it is only a half a million dollars. Mr. Simmons said buying a used ice plant is going to cost $150,000 a year just to maintain it, and that does not include buying the water. He said that is what is happening in downtown Charleston.
Mr. Hartling said it would be useful to have some type of retail sales co-op that would make an easier outlet for the smaller shrimpers and fishermen and would position where the retail customers go because right now they are scattered all over the place. The situation now is that three of the more substantial operations have on land either minor processing and wholesale or retail sales, and they are staffed by people other than the people who are fishing or shrimping. He said the smaller operations are selling to customers generally by text and meeting in a parking lot or hauling their catch onto a truck that they drive somewhere. The idea here would be adding some extra character and creating a more efficient distribution operation, to create a centralized co-op sales facility, and the two obvious possibilities for that are the Wando Dock and the Geechie Dock. And there is a possibility of, if there is a street connection to Mill Street, putting a pavilion at the end of Mill Street. The advantage is there is parking.

Mr. Robertson said that would not require much parking.

Mr. Hartling said it is possible that one of the three that have landside staffing right now might move over there and act as retail clerk, so it
Ms. Anderegg said one of the things that Mr. Lane talked about was a small restaurant down at the Wando Dock, and asked if it would make more sense for that retail space be some type of operation that would sell the catch.

Mr. Lane said it is conceivable, and it could be purchased publicly and remain as its current use for a while. Mr. Hartling said he would suggest it be in the purely public environment and build a minor pavilion – a farmers market for seafood. Mr. Robertson said that would be beneficial to the public and the seafood operators and to contribute toward the working creek preservation.

Mr. Lane said one idea based on some discussion is to create an additional dock on the other side of the Harry Hallman boat ramp. He said he thinks it would work with the navigational situation, and it is possible that the additional dock might be devoted for lay down purposes for non-motorized watercraft. He said it would double the amount of dock space. Mr. Lane said there might need to be an
agreement with the Shem Creek Marina and that might be an issue. He said a disadvantage is the cost, and it might encourage more cartop use exacerbating the parking demand.

Mr. Lane said we have heard that the existing boat trailer parking is very limited and also that the surplus trailers are all over the streets and go up to the Moultrie Plaza. Mr. Lane said he thinks down the road the Moultrie Plaza that fronts Coleman will be very valuable and all that parking lot may be absorbed by other uses and there are a number of things that could be done there that could change the Moultrie Plaza to where the parking would not be available. He said there quite a lot of undeveloped properties, but his thought was maybe extending the trailer parking and turning it into a one-way loop by entering on Simmons street, pull in, back your boat in, and then pull in and park the trailer. He said this is independent of the other ideas, but that would more than double the trailer parking. The sketch shows closing the end of Scott street making that functional trailer parking. It would have to be managed. Mr. Lane said there could be a management office of some kind to support the trailer parking, and there also needs to be a

**Harry Hallman Jr. Boat Ramp**

**III-3 Management/Service Improvements**

- Management agreement between the Town and County for ramp operations and providing maintenance and supervisory staff during peak periods
- Mechanism to charge for trailer and vehicle parking
- User comfort station and possible staff office.
- Mechanism to monitor space availability and notify prospective users when there is no parking space available. This could possibly be done by notification signs along Coleman Boulevard from both arrival directions or by on-line or telephone access information services.

**Advantages**

- Increased services to ramp users
- Control of over-use and local street and parking usage.

**Disadvantages**

- May require additional personnel or funding commitments by Town
- Requires coordination with Charleston County

---

Shem Creek Area Management Plan
mechanism to charge for the trailer parking, which might be able to support at least the management of it. Mr. Lane said other thing is that the ramp is County owned, and he would think this would need some type of agreement between the County and the Town so the Town can take a more control of proactive use of how the ramp and the trailer parking is used.

Ms. Anderegg asked if the County owned and maintained the lot or does the Town. Several people responded that the County owns the lot.

Mr. Lane said it is a County facility but it is causing problems in the Town, so maybe there is a way the Town can be proactive in cooperating with the County. Mr. Lane said it is also important to have a mechanism to monitor space availability so that when no space is available, people can be alerted to that. There also needs to be an enforcement mechanism. He said the advantages are increased services to ramp uses, more control by the Town of the ramp and parking usage. Disadvantages are that it may require additional personnel or funding commitments by the Town and coordination with the County. Mr. Lane said the management effort is a cooperative effort of some kind and also the extending of the trailer parking.
Mr. Lane said another possibility is to include a garage. He said the consultants came up with this before they understood just how acute the parking situation was on this side. Clearly all of these properties are not developed. They are valuable properties and would not be cheap, but will be a lot more expensive down the road. He said a decent size garage could be put in. The rendering shows a garage that includes three trays of parking. The idea of putting a garage in this location might be a way to bundle solving the trailer issue at the Hallman Boat ramp and dealing with the management, and dealing with some of the parking. Mr. Lane said it is possible that inside the garage there could be another use with retail or office on the frontage. If it is two stories, there might be an office on the top floor. It could become a public/private partnership where the lead would be taken by the Town, but some revenue use could be incorporated which would defray some of the cost.

Mr. Robertson said if the walkways came up Lucas Street, they would lead right up to this garage and that might actually make it function to support things on the other side of Coleman.
Mr. Lane said if you look at the area, there are some big sites that are probably ripe for some kind of private development in the future. There has been a lot of talk of encouraging effective use of this study area. A combined facility could accomplish that. They need not be the sizes they are shown, but the idea has some potential, but none of them will be easy to do.
Mr. Lane said the constraints on the central area are the key public rights of way, the wetland areas, the Town-owned land, current zoning restrictions and parking constraints. He said anything that would happen in the central area is dealing with an area that has parking and use constraints by the current zoning. Any more intensive development of the central area must at least incorporate the parking spaces that it is taking away, and add parking spaces they are required to have, which are not easy things to do.
Mr. Lane said at the North Side, there are two questions. One is what should we be thinking about in the near term and the other is what should we be thinking about in the catastrophic long term. Mr. Lane said in this area, the key site that perhaps has some development potential is this large parking lot that serves some of the restaurants, and the reason is because it is zoned Areawide Business. It allows many uses and is in the Waterfront Overlay District. He said the underlying zoning allows certain things, among them are office, retail and restaurants. Mr. Lane said on the of the interesting things about this site is that it has quite a nice view so that there will be some advantage to development and some potential. In this case, it might be conceivable to not only retain the existing parking, but also increase the parking to support another use. One possibility would be somewhere between 20-35,000 square feet of office, and it could be done without seeing the looming presence that is seen at 111 Coleman. The advantage would be increased tax, and also in the case of office, particularly, some of the things that are not being taken advantage of at 111 Coleman, such as if there is office space parking, it could be...
made available during off-peak office hours, which are evenings and weekends and would supplement the parking available.

Mr. Lane said the disadvantages would be increased density of development and change the visual character of wetland edge and business access.

There was mentioned that there could possibly be a hotel there. Ms. Anderegg expressed concern about Vickery’s and Water’s Edge losing their parking spaces. Mr. Lane said if a hotel were put there, the developer would need to replace the spaces that were taken away by the building, as well as create the required parking for the building.

Mr. Barnwell said Mr. Lane spoke of the number of parking spaces need to be retained. He asked if there was a formal relationship between Vickery’s, the restaurant and the Shem Creek Inn because they must have gotten a variance for parking. He asked if they could use the spaces for their own use – are they required to replace those spaces for other tenants.

Mr. Randall said the Town would probably try to make that consideration, but he does not know how successful that would be.

Mr. Robertson said there may be private arrangements that have been made particularly because that lot is signed for Vickery’s.

Ms. Anderegg said she understands there is an agreement between Vickery’s and Water’s Edge, however she has heard it is going to be up for renewal very soon.

Mr. Robertson said the consultants made the assumption that the parking spaces would be kept to support the uses.

Ms. Anderegg said as recent as last year the Shem Creek Inn was allowed to remove some of their parking to allow for the awning and the improvements to the outside.

Mr. Lane said aside from redevelopment of sites along Shem Creek, that is the site that is clearly in play.
Mr. Lane said that for most of the south side most of the parking is essential, however on an individual basis we found that Saltwater Cowboys has a surplus of parking by the Town’s minimum standard. He said also that site has a very nice view of the harbor and the marsh. It is conceivable that some amount of expansion could happen on this site and still be supplied by parking and zoning.
Mr. Lane said the last opportunity the team sees is modification of the Waterfront Overlay Zone (shown in blue), and it does not include provisions. The only provision is prohibition of jet skis and the allowance of any uses which are not in the marine district. Mr. Lane said one of the thoughts the team had was to modify the overlay district by creating sub-areas within it. One of the thoughts that prompted that was looking at the Boulevard District on Coleman which has many subdistricts that have very particular requirements. Mr. Lane said there are at least half a dozen different conditions in the Waterfront Overlay district that apply. The first are to the structures that immediately front on Shem Creek. The second is the area to the north of those, next is some of the marsh and areas including the Geechie docks, next is the area and the vicinity of the Wando Dock, The Wreck and the dry stacks, and lastly the area on the other side of Coleman.
He said there might be different requirements or ideas promulgated for these, and the Team came up with a few suggestions. For example particularly in the area of the center, there is a concern to anticipate the rebuild or replacement of the existing waterfront buildings if something happens to them or they get redeveloped. Mr. Lane said one of the things that could be included in such a provision is the retention of some type of public access along the side of Shem Creek. Also there might be some provisions to deal with setback, height and character. He said just looking at the different buildings he thinks that one of the clear characters of the existing structures is some variation in height. Mr. Lane said the height of these structures varies roughly from about 30-37 feet and the façade elements themselves, the length varies from 40-55 feet where they have constant elements. One of the characteristics is considerable variety in height and massing and it is evident if you look at the elevation, that the relatively constant height of what is on Coleman is a little alien to what we are looking at on Shem Creek. He said the character of most of the frontage of Shem Creek is a series of buildings that are varied in scale, height and massing. Mr. Lane said it is not quite so comparable on the north side, with the principal being the Shem Creek Inn.
Z-1 Modification of Waterfront Overlay Zone

Elements to Consider:

- Minimum building setback of 15 feet from the parcel edge closest to the water to enable pedestrian access along the water’s edge;
- Maintenance of a continuous public access of at least 10 feet wide on the parking or entry side of the buildings, enabling connection to adjoining properties.
- Variation of building cornice and/or eave height in order to create scale and visual variety in building form, with maximum uninterrupted length of 60 feet;
- Variation of building height with a maximum roof height of 45 feet along the front façade, with a maximum height of 55 feet for no more than 50% of the building façade facing the creek, setback at least 15 feet from the front façade. This stepped back height increase would compensate for any loss of permitted building area due to more stringent flood and creek protection guidelines.
- Incorporation of slope and/or gabled roof for 100% of the creek façade and 50% of all other facades
- Parking requirements to be further studied.
- Other design or material guidelines to be determined.

Mr. Lane reviewed the elements to consider on the (Z-1) slide above stating that he had decided he was not in favor of the 55 foot height.

Shem Creek Interpretive Sites

1. Wando Property – permanent, enclosed structure.
2. Town Park -- extension of the existing structure & create a series of durable exhibit panels.
3. West of Vickery’s -- platform over the marsh, an outdoor exhibit
4. Near Geechie Dock -- part of a walkway system encircling the south site of the creek.
Mr. Lane said the last opportunity is interpretation of the history of the creek. The team came up with four possible sites where that might occur. One is near the Town park, the next is near the boardwalk near Vickery’s, the fourth is near Geechie dock, and last is an option at the Wando Dock. Those are all possibilities.

Ms. Sims mentioned at the Town’s existing park on the boardwalk itself there are historical panels on the railing.

Mr. Lane said it does not need to be an enclosed building but could be a set of panels under a roof of some type.

Ms. Anderegg asked about the modifications and when Mr. Lane said he was not in favor of the 55 foot height limit, she asked if he was saying that it needed to be higher because you are still talking about building up 14 or 17 feet. Mr. Lane said right now with the current zoning the limit is forty. Ms. Anderegg said then there would be no gabled roofs but flat tops all the way across. Mr. Lane said it depends on what you do. Most of those structures have one active floor, and he was surprised to find that the height of the structures on one side of the creek varies from the other side by 30-37 feet. Ms. Anderegg said those buildings are basically on the ground and they will not be able to build on the ground should everything be washed away in a hurricane. Mr. Lane said there is a certain height they would have to be and they would have to make that work. He said he would be reluctant to have fifty-five feet over all. If there will be a higher amount, it would need to be limited to a certain maximum portion of the building and not be on the frontage of Shem Creek.

Mr. Robertson said if the buildings were to be set back from the creek a little further you could build them a little higher and you would still have the same feel from the creek.

Mr. Randall said he did speak with the Flood Plane Manager and the current flood zone is to be 1 foot above the flood elevation. That could potentially change to 2 feet above the flood elevation. It is based on credits received on insurance, making the insurance rates lower. They
are looking to it, and do not see any exceptions to build for a town-wide credit. If the bottom floor is flood-proofed, you can build below the two foot level. There are some ways to design around certain things. The height requirements are measured from the ground outside of the building, not from the level of the creek.

“Getting It Right”

Further Discussion and Questions?

Mr. Lane said they intend to absorb those comments and think about them pretty carefully. One of the challenges is going to be to assemble these and other ideas as they may be modified into scenarios that can show meaningful directions for the study area.

Ms. Woods-Flowers said going back to the dismal public information meeting the previous evening, the Town has done a lot of fantastic videos that have drawn interest from the public. She said she wished one could be put together and shown every day. If the Town would generate something like that and start sending that out at the end of April in anticipating of this meeting to generate more interest, she thinks it would be more helpful. Ms. Woods-Flowers said she did not see any communication on that meeting and that is unfortunate. She said this could be posted on NextDoor. There needs to be more visibility, the Mayor needs to talk about it. Council needs to talk about
it. Everyone who has something to do with the success of this plan needs to be talking about it, and the Town needs to be more public about what is going on. She said she is not trying to be critical, but we need more people here, because we cannot finalize this until we have that input.

Mr. Robertson said he interviewed the Council when the team was doing the inventory and the baseline and some of them were very forthcoming, but he only spoke with 60 percent, and the other 40 percent did not return is call so he does not know if they are against what is going on. He said if there are people on Council that should be encouraged to participate, some of the Committee members might want to talk to them to see if you can gauge their interest.

Ms. Sims said from the Town’s perspective this was published as a calendar event so it is available on our public website, it was directly emailed to thousands of people in the community, it was posted on our social media page which has 10’s of thousands of followers. Ms. Woods-Flowers said she was not saying it was not publicized, but she thinks it needs to be given greater attention. She said great attention is given to Blessing of the Fleet and this is a huge planning document and this should be given the kind of attention that we do to any major issue. She thinks it needs to be given a huge splash.

Ms. Sims said part of it is the understanding piece of the resources available, and so we do not have a plan to go off of to even create a video at this point in time. She said the plan in it’s raw form was put on the website and it was attached to the meeting invitation. People need to step up too. If they care about this they need to be looking for this information and they need to be signed up to receive it. Ms. Sims said she had a sheet out the previous night asking people to sign up for information, and hardly anyone signed up.

Ms. Sims said as a Committee, you are the advocates of this plan. That is why you were put together, and you have strong voices in the community that we will never be able to reach. She said we have utilized avenues that are accessible to us. Ms. Sims said she would ask
the Committee to go out there and make sure people are aware of this next meeting. We want people to be involved in it, and we want people to sign up to receive news and alerts of the town and pay attention to our social media but we cannot force them to do that. She said that is part of the role of this Committee is to generate attention and make sure people are aware of it and are coming to the meetings to provide feedback into the whole process. That is why it is an advisory committee – you are providing the input in the process.

Mr. Robertson said the next meetings will be dealing with how to assemble some of these opportunities that make sense or maybe alternative ways of looking at the future. That might be a good time for someone to show up. He said it is a lot easier to understand when you are not talking about a list of twenty-five things or what we already learned.

3. Review next steps and overall concerns going forward

Next Steps in the Process:
Big Ideas & Choices

- SAC Meeting #4
  - April 17, 2019:
    - 9 a.m. at the Mount Pleasant Town Hall, Third Floor Committee Room
- Public Meeting
  - May 21, 2019:
    - 5 p.m. at the Mount Pleasant Town Hall, Police Training Room, First Floor
4. Next Meeting

A) Shem Creek Study Advisory Committee Meeting #4 – April 17, 2019
(9am Mount Pleasant Town Hall, Police Training Room)

The next Committee meeting is April 17, and the next public input meeting is on May 21st.

Mr. Randall said we would like to make the next public meeting more promoted to get the input we need.

Mr. Bennett asked if it would be possible to change the schedule a bit to accept more public input at the April 17 meeting so maybe that is a 5-7:00 meeting or have two meetings. Mr. Bennett said his logic is since we were disappointed at the turnout the previous night, that maybe we go the extra mile to accept more input early on in the process.

Mr. Lane said they are flexible but the general thought was to float information in front of this group before it goes out to the public, which is why there was a lag in terms of the first public input meeting. Ms. Woods-Flowers said she thought Mr. Bennett was thinking an evening meeting would allow more people to attend. Mr. Bennett responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Robertson said we might consider moving the April 17 meeting to an evening meeting, but what he is thinking is that the ideas are going to be rough at that point, and it would be more desirable for the public to see something a little more thought out. Ms. Sims said we are still accepting public comments from the comments sheet. She said she would be happy to make that available on line and set a deadline for comments.

Mr. Bennett said he thinks that would be helpful to structure the comments and provide some sort of standard format.

Mr. Hartling said the Town could push out the comment sheet, which they have electronically. Ms. Sims said the forms can be e-mailed, mailed or dropped at Town Hall.
Mr. Martschink asked if notices were sent to the property owners and the operators of the businesses. Ms. Sims responded in the negative. She said we do not send direct notices to anyone. If they are signed up through our Notify Me Module, it has to be an elective item as we were told not to directly e-mail.

Mr. Martschink said we are talking about changing these people’s zoning and he thinks they need to be notified. Ms. Sims said if she has a list of all of their e-mail addresses she would be happy to send them notifications.

Mr. Barnwell said Mr. Martschink is correct. We are talking about the value of these properties and if you take a property down from 55 to 50 feet and raise it off the ground, then you have knocked out a floor of development.

Mr. Robertson said the goal would not be to do that.

Mr. Martschink said any changes made to the design standards or to usability or property affects the value of the property whether it is up or down. He said he thinks these people need to know. He said if you are worried about getting people here, tell them you are doing something that is going to affect their property value and they will show up.

Ms. Sims said she would be happy to contact them if anyone had a list of e-mail addresses. She stated the next committee meeting would be April 17, and she will forward the updated opportunities report along with a link to the comment form and she asked the Committee to please disseminate them to people and we will work on an appropriate cut-off date so that we are not holding them up in the process of developing those alternatives. She said keep in mind, the whole intent behind this is to develop alternatives. It is not that we are moving forward in any one single direction. Whatever this committee develops must go through the public approval process.
Mr. Lane said there needs to be alternatives to the entire area, not just specific sites.
Ms. Flynn asked if there were opportunities that were identified by members of the Task Force that the consultants said did not make the cut. She asked how they went through that vetting process, and if some did not make the cut, which ones were they.
Mr. Robertson said they are pretty much all there, and there were some things he heard at the public input meeting the previous night that were not in there such as a boardwalk around the whole waterfront.

7. Adjourn
   There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:52 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Barrett
Clerk of Council