

**MOUNT PLEASANT TOWN COUNCIL
Tuesday, April 12, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.
Municipal Complex, Council Chambers
100 Ann Edwards Lane
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464**

MINUTES

Mayor Page called the Town Council Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Council Members Elton Carrier, Bob Brimmer, Mark Smith, Joe Bustos, Will Haynie and Jim Owens were present. Paul Gawrych and Gary Santos were absent.

I. PRAYER

Chaplain Shane Bowers led Council in prayer.

II. PLEDGE

Mr. Brimmer led Council in the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Mr. Pagliarini certified compliance with the Freedom of Information Act.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Carrier moved for approval of the agenda; seconded by Mr. Owens.

Mr. Smith requested to move the Fish Market item (IX.C.1) up on the agenda to just before Planning New Business.

Mr. Brimmer moved to amend the agenda as requested by Mr. Smith; seconded by Mr. Owens. All present voted in favor.

All voted in favor to approve the amended agenda.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS, AWARDS & PRESENTATIONS

A. Days of Remembrance Proclamation

Town Council presented the Days of Remembrance Proclamation to Rabbi Refson and the Jewish Community to remember and honor the victims and survivors of the Holocaust.

B. Longevity Awards

Town Council and Deputy Chief, Stan Gregg presented the longevity award to Sonia Johnson of the Police Department for twenty years of service.

Town Council and Chief Financial Officer, Marcy Cotov presented the longevity award to Jan Crates, Deputy Director of Administrative Services for twenty five years of service.

C. Spark Award Recognition

Town Council and Katherine Hendricks, Assistant Town Administrator, recognized Ashley Richardson, Cultural Affairs & Tourism Officer (CAT) Office for receiving the Spark Award, which is issued to the most innovative marketing and public relations professionals in the industry. The CAT office received the award in the category for “best mobile app” for the Experience Mount Pleasant app. She stated that CAT was also a finalist in “best copywriting” for the Mount Pleasant Visitor’s Guide.

Town Council and Ms. Hendricks also recognized Martine Wolfe-Miller, Communications Office Director for winning the Hermes Creative Award. This is an international organization which is administered by the Association of Marketing and Communication professionals and over 6,000 entries were submitted last year. She stated that this is Fortune 500 companies up against governmental entities. She stated that the 2015 State of the Town Address won the Platinum Award which is the highest award. She said the Town Administrator’s E-Brief won the Gold Award which is a collaborative

effort with Lauren Sims, Government Outreach Officer. She stated that the Communications Office also won Honorable Mention for the Quick Fact Fridays Musical Legends, which is a collaborative effort with the Historical Commission. She stated that “How to Avoid Kitchen Burns” and “The Journey” the cinema fire series in collaboration with the Mount Pleasant Fire Department also won Honorable Mention.

D. Employee of the Month

Town Council and Recreation Director, Mr. Ken Ayoub recognized Diana Drake for her work with the Jones Center Twenty Five Year Anniversary Celebration. Ms. Drake was recommended for this award by the 25 Year Anniversary Committee that put together the celebrations, because of her extraordinary work in organizing this event.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 23 AND MARCH 31, 2016 SPECIAL TOWN COUNCIL MEETINGS, THE MARCH 8, 2016 TOWN COUNCIL MEETING AND THE MARCH 2016 FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

Mr. Smith moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Carrier. All present voted in favor.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PUBLIC STATEMENTS

Sean Barns lives in the Indian Village of Mount Pleasant and stated that his concern tonight and for the past few years is the speeding on McCants Drive, Center Street and the side streets. He stated that this has continued to increase. He appreciates Council’s assistance on how to obtain speed humps, but it is taking too long. He stated that he is interested in saving lives, because without speed humps and stop signs, lives are going to be lost. There is enough money to accomplish this first before Coleman Boulevard, because people will begin taking Center and McCants once Coleman is revitalized. He asked about purchasing a speed bump and having the Town or DOT install it.

Bill Macchio, 1216 Decoy Court, stated that we need more people like Cori Pavlicko working for the Town of Mount Pleasant and more leaders like Ken Ayoub that allow employees to think outside of the box. He stated that he is excited to publish this for the Town and wish more people like Ms. Pavlicko were working for the Town.

Cori Pavlicko thanked Mr. Macchio and stated that the Recreation Department's magazine, "*In Motion*" which is more than a magazine, but a mindset. She said that Recreation may steer an individual, a community or a nation and it is her hope that this magazine will encourage individuals to see all that the Town's Recreation Department has to offer and to stay active and in motion.

Barry Wolff, 1468 Pocahontas Street stated that the US is still a democracy and in a democracy, officials are elected to serve the citizens and represent the will and wishes of those that elected them as a body. In November, a clear message was sent to Council at the election. Some decided to ignore the message sent to Council. He applauds the initiatives put forth by Councilman Bustos as the citizens are tired of the runaway development that has been fueled by previous administrations and embraced by some on Council. Slow it down, shorten it up and live by the spirit of the comprehensive plan when it comes to ADU's. He said if the Town has regulations, make sure there are resources to enforce them and understand the impact that the 6,000 approved housing units will have on an already struggling infrastructure. Listen to the people.

Richard Townes, 313 Mallard Court said that he appreciates all the great work and dedication of Council and staff. He has a few questions. Six months ago, a growth management plan was passed and Council worked very hard for seven months prior. He asked where the Town is on the goals that were set.

Mayor Page stated that this is a time to address Council, not a question and answer period.

Mr. Townes said that these are the items he wanted to address, because he is curious to know what happened to the growth

management plan. He said that six months in retrospect, where does Council see other goals that need to be in place, voted on, and worked on by staff to assist with what was established in the first growth management plan. He stated that he is curious as to where Council stands right now and what is expected to be accomplished in the future. He stated that this is what the citizens need to know.

Chris Kiel, 1426 South Jetties Court and owner of Chris' Dry Cleaning at 808 Coleman Boulevard, stated that he would like to speak against the proposed raised median in front of his business. He stated that he would like to thank Gary Santos, Jim Owens, Will Haynie and Joe Bustos for their support. He stated that he sent Mr. Carrier emails since 2011 and never received a response and when he asked Mr. Carrier, he said "there was nothing to respond to". He stated that he does not understand why Mr. Carrier should hold a Council position when he cannot respond to the citizens, taxpayers and business owners of the Town. He sent Mr. Smith an email on October 28, 2015 on another subject and never received a response. He said that Mr. Smith came to his business 47 days later and agreed that he did not like the idea of a raised median in front of his business and would not want one in front of his funeral home business.

Rial Fitch, 704 Hobcaw Bluff Drive and owner of Mount Pleasant Seafood with his family at 1 Seafood Drive on Shem Creek said he appreciates what Council does. He said that he would like to speak about the Seafood Market on the agenda which was brought to his attention by Councilman Smith and Commissioner John Burn. He said they presented a proposal for a Saturday morning only Seafood Market in the vicinity of the Waterfront Park. He said that his initial reaction was that it would remove all the selling from the roadways and parking lots on Shem Creek, so he advised Mr. Smith that he was in favor of the proposal. He stated that when Mr. Smith presented this to a Committee of Council, he was 100% accurate. He said since that time, he has changed his mind and is not in favor of a Seafood Market in the Mount Pleasant area, because there are seafood markets that are long standing such as Simmons Seafood, Mount Pleasant Seafood

and others around and on Shem Creek. He said that the Town does not need to sponsor a seafood market in the Town and asked that it not be approved.

Rev. Richard Harkness, 342 Old South Way is here on behalf of his church, Olive Branch AME Church and Johnson Development. He said they have been working with the development group for over a year and now working out a land swap to assist with their development. He is here to speak in favor of approval and said some of the changes will be beneficial to the church. He stated that they have a positive working relationship with the developer.

Myra Snipe Richardson, 2755 Royal Johnson Lane said she is also here to discuss the Johnson Development on Highway 17 north. She said that as a part of the project, a traffic light will be installed in front of Mattress America which will impact her mother and brother's driveways. She said that the way it is lining up, it appears that the plans are to connect Hungryneck Boulevard to Highway 17. She stated that currently traffic is coming through her mother's yard to get from one mattress store to the other and once the barrier is put up by the AT&T shop, it will create a big issue for their family and the safety of their children. She stated that over the last month, they have had three water line breaks because vehicles come through at a high rate of speed. She has erected two gated fences in the front and back. She said the back gate will be locked at all times, because it is a private drive for 1767-A and 1767-B. She said they are not in the Town of Mount Pleasant, but the County and that the overdevelopment is squeezing the black families out of this area. She said that the overdevelopment of Mount Pleasant is destroying the way of life for the people that love this Town and have had homes here for up to six generations. She asked Council to slow down development because it is destroying the Town.

Rich Estes, 1300 Appling Drive stated that he would like to discuss item #5 about the moratorium on multi-family housing. He stated that he has the pleasure of serving on the Town's Affordable Housing Task Force and even in current conditions, implementing affordable and

workforce housing is not an easy task. He stated that everything is already stacked up against them. He said that right or wrong about this item, please consider affordable and workforce housing. He stated that multi-family zoning and housing is becoming the only way to obtain affordable and workforce housing. He stated that land prices are too high to build single family affordable workforce housing this is something that the Town will be faced with long after tonight. He said to consider this when making their decisions.

Tom Hodges, 1516 Young Street said that he is in support of having the ADU's and short term rentals. He stated that Council originally wrote a good ordinance, but it just needs to be enforced correctly. He stated that this has provided his family the opportunity to move into the school district his children wanted to attend and gives him the opportunity to offset his mortgage payment that he may not otherwise be able to afford. He stated that they use their ADU for short term rentals, but others utilize theirs for home offices. He said that some use their ADU's to provide affordable long term housing. He said that apartments in Mount Pleasant are very high and ADU's provide an affordable opportunity for renters. He said that the Town ordinance requires separate designated parking for ADU's does not believe it adds to the infrastructure problems people are worried about. He supports ADU's.

Sarah "Sally" Jacob, 1152 Village Creek Lane and is here to speak on behalf of multi-family housing, but is mainly concerned about senior housing. She said if the Town does not have multi-family housing, the seniors will not be able to afford rentals. She said she brought rental rates from Seven Farms Village. A one bedroom minimum that you must have in order to rent is \$1,237.00 and the maximum income at the 50% level is \$22,050.00. She said that the rental for one is \$495.00. She stated that the average rent in Mount Pleasant exceeds \$1,000 per month. She said there needs to be rentals for ordinary people.

Glyn Cowden, 737 Bloomfield Drive said that he is excited to see Agenda Items 4-7 under New Business. He stated that the word

“consideration” needs to be changed to “implementation”. He stated that six months after the election, it has not been addressed. He stated that Nancy Fairless who lives in Mount Pleasant on the Sullivan’s Island Beach Express Highway also known as Simmons Street has asked that he deliver a letter to Council members.

Leslie Walch, 1547 Hidden Bridge Drive stated that she would like to discuss the short term rentals, specifically short terms rentals in her own home and sharing a room in her home. She said that currently, the law reads that if she has a dwelling and she wants to do short term rental and not live there, this is allowable. She said that Council has discussed concerns about noise, garbage, parking, etc. She said that she is there every night to regulate this and wants the same consideration her neighbors all desire; however, it would be impossible to do so the way the law currently exists. She said if she moved out of her house and lived elsewhere, it would be allowable. She said that doing short term rentals in her home make it affordable for her to live there and pay the mortgage. She asked that the Committee assigned to look at this, to look at sharing the home and not people that are going out and investing in properties an turning them over to investment companies.

Paul Mount, 1481 Center Street Extension in Bay Club. He said that he is fortunate to have a job where he can work out of his home. He said that he chose to live in Mount Pleasant because it has certain features such as quality of life, attractiveness of the neighborhoods, etc., and these proposals are ways to get back to the value that is in Mount Pleasant. He said that if the Town continues to build multi-family “glorified dormitories” no added value is provided to Mount Pleasant. He said that he has heard people talk about affordable housing and that multi-family is the only way to accomplish this, but said this is not the case at all; it must be addressed specifically.

Mayor Page stated that the agenda was amended earlier to move Item **IX.C.1 Approval to establish a fish market at Mount Pleasant Farmers Market** to just before planning. She asked Mr. Smith to discuss.

Mr. Smith stated that in the Economic Development Committee meeting last week, there was a unanimous recommendation to Council and this would be in a form of a motion for full Council consideration for a low-key Saturday Fisherman's Wharf at the existing Coleman Boulevard Farmer's Market location from 8 am to 12 noon, with the stipulation that only the Shem Creek based fisherman, no outside vendors will be allowed, and minimal staff time would be designated for the running of the Fish Market at the Farmer's Market at Coleman Boulevard.

Mr. Smith stated that this is his motion; seconded by Mr. Brimmer.

Mr. Smith stated that after attending the Utility Conference with Mount Pleasant Waterworks and representing the Town of Mount Pleasant for an Economic Development Trip in San Diego, Water Commissioner and former Council Member, John Burn and he were able to personally visit the Saturday morning Fisherman's Wharf in San Diego. He said it was an incredible opportunity to talk first hand to the fisherman, interact with the customers and to see the positive energy that existed from local families patronizing and buying local fish. He said it was a wonderful experience. He said that understanding the challenges that the fishing industry has been faced with over the years, led him to get involved last year with Tommy and Grace Edwards by participating and helping to sponsor the Chicks of the Sea event last year. He also attended meetings held by Mayor Page with the Shem Creek fishermen. He stated that this is a great opportunity for the Town to address the safety concerns about the roadside sales of fish, shrimp and other catch. He stated that he is confident that the Town has the same affection and love of those working the boats at Shem Creek and wanting them to remain for years to come. He stated that he hopes this motion passes unanimously to send a strong message to the fishermen and shrimpers on Shem Creek that Town Council recognizes their concerns. He stated that the fish market would be utilizing an existing asset that is already in place for the Tuesday Farmer's Market on Coleman Boulevard creating a designated

area with the permission of Charleston County School District on Saturdays from 8 am – 12 pm on a seasonal basis for a trial period.

Mr. Haynie stated that the Town has invested millions in Shem Creek Park Phase I which provides parking. He stated that they are finishing up the boardwalk along the creek that he hopes will help the brick and mortar businesses near Mount Pleasant Seafood. He stated that this is a good start and will evolve and is in support.

Mr. Carrier said that he purchases his shrimp from Tommy Edwards. He stated that there is the Gee Chee Docks and the individual Fishermen and Rial Fitch and they are all in business on the creek. He stated that he does not want to hurt these businesses. He said if this is a trial basis for one day a week in conjunction with the Farmers Market, he will support it, but beyond that, he will not. He said that he does not want to hurt the businesses on the creek.

Mr. Smith clarified and said that his motion is for Saturdays only from 8 am – 12 noon at the existing Farmers Market location on the corner of Coleman Boulevard and Simmons Street.

Mr. Bustos asked if Mr. Smith knew who would participate in the Fisherman's Market and secondly, have any costs been determined to the Town for cleanup. He stated that he knows at the Farmers Market, there is staff present. He asked if there was any synergy to have it at the Farmers Market on Tuesdays.

Mr. Smith stated that 100% of the Shem Creek based fishermen were surveyed and the majority of them were willing and interested in participating in the market, including Tommy Edwards. He stated that this market is not open to any vendors outside of Shem Creek. He stated that this is the Town's effort to save Shem Creek fisheries. He stated that he has had significant discussions with staff regarding the area where fishermen would set up and sell. He stated that staff involvement would be minimal.

Mr. Owens suggested that a meeting of the minds come together regarding the Town and how The Creek is celebrated and what we do going forward with this initiative. He said he appreciates Mr. Smith

and Mr. Haynie's efforts and the work they have done in the Economic Development Committee. He believes that Council should explore all avenues when attempting to assist the shrimpers and take every opportunity available without harming the retailers on the creek. He said there is an opportunity to do something special and substantial not only for the shrimpers, but the Town in particular. He asked if there is any reason why the fishermen and shrimpers could not be incorporated into the Tuesday Farmers Market.

Ms. Richardson, Cultural Affairs and Tourism Director stated that there are two application processes. One is a food vendor and the other is a Farmer. She stated that shrimpers are classified as farmers, because they harvest their seafood and an application is submitted for consideration by the Board. She said they made the application process aware to the shrimpers and fishermen; however, only one submitted and that was Tommy Cannon.

Mayor Page asked Ms. Richardson about staff involvement in running the Farmers Market.

Ms. Richardson stated there is a dedicated Market Manager and her responsibility is collecting applications, ensuring that applicants have the proper licenses and regulations, the layout of the market, as well as working with Police and Public Services to ensure their staff is present for the event. Since it is on school property, they coordinate with Moultrie Middle School administration to ensure their regulations are being followed. She is also responsible for collecting vendor fees each week and is present at the Farmers Market from 1 pm to 7 pm every Tuesday throughout the season.

Mayor Page stated that for the proposed Saturday market, there will not be any dedicated staff member, any fees associated or licensing, etc.

Ms. Richardson stated that this would be up to Town Council if they would like to proceed similar to the Farmers Market as a Town event, then staffing would be required to collect vendor fees. She said that another option would be to consider an agreement for a permit

process for a social event and the organization such as Shem Creek Fisheries could be responsible for handling the payments process and making sure regulations are covered.

Mr. Brimmer stated that this is a good opportunity to increase exposure to the industry. He said there are new residents who may not be aware of the rich history and the activities of the Creek and this would be in a visible, high traffic location which can only help the industry increase sales and believes it is a good start.

Mr. Carrier stated that the task force is going to be discussed and he is concerned that this may be premature and could be incorporated into the task force's effort. He stated that whatever Council does, it needs to be effective and this may mean having the task force evaluate it.

Mr. Owens stated that the work that the Economic Development Committee has done warrants Council's ability to move forward. He stated that this is a pilot program and in the event that it is successful and continues, the details can certainly be worked out to be incorporated into the task force.

Mr. Carrier stated that he and the Mayor have made attempts on the creek and it has not been successful.

Mayor Page asked Mr. Smith if this was being presented as a pilot or test program and if there is a timeframe. She asked if there was direction for staff.

Mr. Smith stated that there is a shrimping season and it could run as long as November. He is requesting to run through the end of the year and reevaluate the program at the end of the season based on participation, whether it was beneficial to them and for the community, which would be good criteria for evaluation. He encouraged everyone to buy local and support the local shrimpers and fishermen.

Ms. Richardson asked for clarification on whether this would be operated like the Farmers Market or would this be through an agreement process and Shem Creek Fisheries would be responsible for the regulations.

Mr. Smith stated that he would state in his motion that the Town has a very capable staff and whatever they recommend would be the area to go with. He also has no objections to having Shem Creek Fisheries operate this as well, benefiting all the fishermen on the creek through a special permit.

All present voted in favor.

Town Council adjourned for a short break at 7:15 p.m. and reconvened at 7:23 p.m.

VIII. PLANNING – Ms. Farrell

[Planning Committee Minutes](#)

[Planning Commission Minutes](#)

A. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. First Reading:** An Ordinance providing for the annexation of an approximately 5.564 acre portion of an approximately 16.48 acre tract of land, located at 2996 Joseph Glover Road in the Phillips Community, identified by TMS No. 583-00-00-003, a portion thereof, and depicted as lot 34-A on a plat recorded by the Charleston County RMC Office in Book L15, Page 0053. (Ord. No. 16030)

Mr. Smith moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Owens.

Mr. Carrier asked if the motion could also include Item #2 which is the zoning.

Mr. Smith amended his motion; Mr. Owens amended his second.

Mr. Haynie asked if there was any feedback from the Philips Community.

Ms. Farrell responded in the negative.

Mr. Haynie asked if this was something to facilitate development in a cultural community where it may be obtrusive.

Ms. Farrell stated that the density is consistent with the land use recommendations for both the Town of Mount Pleasant and Charleston County in this area. She stated that they have asked for R1 zoning for lot sizes which is 10,000 sf and is recognized within the Town's comprehensive plan as a zoning district that is compatible with this particular land use. She said when developed, it will be more of a typical suburban type of development.

Mr. Haynie asked if the applicant was present and what the nature of the development is.

Coley Snowden, stated that he is representing Anchor Engineering and the area proposed is already connected to an area annexed R1 and the property was combined, but only a portion was annexed at the time and they are now requesting annexation of the remaining portion. He stated that members of the Philips Community were present at the Planning Commission meeting and did not speak against it and they have a tentative meeting set up for Tuesday of next week.

All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read *FIRST READING BY TITLE ONLY*.

- 2. First Reading:** An Ordinance to zone R-1, Low Density Residential District, an approximately 5.564 acre portion of an approximately 16.48 acre tract of land located at 2996 Joseph Glover Road in the Phillips Community, identified by TMS No. 583-00-00-003, a portion thereof, and depicted as Lot 34-A on a plat recorded by the Charleston County RMC Office in Book L15, Page 0053. (Ord. No. 16031)

[Approved with Item #1 above]

Mr. DeMoura read *FIRST READING BY TITLE ONLY*.

- 3. First Reading:** An Ordinance providing for the annexation of an approximately 2.82 acre tract of land comprised of three parcels, located on Alice Smalls Road, identified by TMS Nos. 578-00-00-

022, 578-00-00-341 and 578-00-00-314, and depicted on a plat recorded by the Charleston County RMC Office in Book DB, Page 170 and Book CC, Page 164 respectively. (Ord. No. 16032)

Mr. Owens moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Smith.

Ms. Farrell stated that this request is only for annexation and the land use recommendation is Community Conservation and lot sizes will have to be 12,500 sf. She stated that the property on the other side of the street has already been annexed so they are moving towards a development plan and the Town will expect certain improvements, especially with roads that meet the Town's standards. She stated that the density and lot sizes will be compatible with what is required in Community Conservation.

All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read *FIRST READING BY TITLE ONLY.*

4. Consideration of amending or creating new ordinances concerning building height, accessory dwelling units and short term rentals.

Mayor Page stated that these items were reviewed by the Planning Committee at special meetings and asked Ms. Farrell to provide an overview of what was discussed.

Ms. Farrell stated that she will separate all three categories. She stated with respect to building height, which was specific to Coleman and Ben Sawyer Boulevards which were reviewed by the Planning Committee at a February 22nd special meeting. She said they did have discussion and in the end made a recommendation to *"continue discussion at Town Council if necessary, but no recommendations to height be made at this time by the Committee, though the issue can be sent back to this Committee for additional discussion at a later date as Town Council deems appropriate."*

Mr. Bustos stated that he understands that Mr. Santos requested these items on the agenda and asked if it would be appropriate to defer to next month since he is not present to articulate his concerns.

Mr. Bustos made a motion to defer item #4 to next month so Mr. Santos is present to provide his concerns; seconded by Mr. Haynie.

Mayor Page stated that it is her understanding to bring Item #4 back to Town Council and not the Planning Committee.

Mr. Bustos responded in the affirmative.

All present voted in favor.

5. Consideration of imposing a moratorium on multi-family developments.

Mr. Bustos stated for the past few months there have been discussions in the Planning Committee regarding traffic, school and infrastructure and that the Town is falling behind. He stated that he would like to provide information that comes from the 2015 demographics report that the Town produced. He stated that in 2010, there were 67,843 and now there are 78,988 as of 2015 which is an increase of 11,145 people or 16% in five years. He stated that the schools currently have over thirty portable classrooms in the northern portion of Mount Pleasant. He stated that the Fire Department calls, which were primarily medical calls in 2013, were 6,677 and in 2015 rose to 8,266, an increase of 1,589 calls or 23%. He stated that Highway 41 would not be widened anytime soon and the number of additional lanes leaving Mount Pleasant since the construction of the Ravenel Bridge is zero, although there are 11,145 additional residents. He stated that there are also discussions about affordable housing; however, the reality is over the past five to six years, no affordable housing has been created. He stated that the affordable housing property that was set aside was rezoned last

year to single family homes because the developer was not able to produce affordable housing. He stated that the Town's impact fees are also behind. He stated in the 2011/2012 school year, there were 11,659 children in school. In the 2014/2015 school year, it was 12,752 students. He stated that the Town's Recreation program had 19,286 participants in athletics; 55,520 participants in programs; 2,667 members in the Senior Center; nearly 44,000 individuals registered for at least one Recreation Department program. He stated that the Town has grown, there are a lot of residents, traffic is bad, schools are full and he feels that Town Council needs to address this. He said as he drives around the Town he sees many multi-family developments that are ongoing. He stated that the Town needs to pause and digest those developments and if not, the Town is going to overwhelm the infrastructure. He said this means all Town staff (fire, police, recreation, public services, stormwater), and believes the first steps to starting a reasonable growth management program is to stop with the multi-family; not close anyone down who is currently in the process, but step back from the multi-family developments, which create more cars, people and strain on infrastructure.

Mr. Bustos made a motion to impose a moratorium until the Town is able to see whether or not we have the ability to digest any additional multi-family developments; seconded by Mr. Haynie.

Mr. Haynie asked if Ms. Farrell could bring up the Town map. Mr. Farrell stated that she put dots on the map that shows what is under construction or under review and then approved. Mr. Haynie stated that he wants the community to know that we are not closing Mount Pleasant for business. He state that there are 324 units at Bridgeside and are approved for 573 units. He said the Tides have 55 family units, not apartments, but are multi-family. Oyster Park is 254 units and site development is

going on at Six Mile Marketplace 92 units, Indigo Square will be 456 units and Rivers Walk Phase II will be 78 more units. He said in Haven Phase II there are 140 more units and Carolina Park can have 530 units in two apartment complexes and the Boulevard Phase II will have 105 units. He stated that these are a lot of apartment units coming online very shortly. He has discussed with other communities, how to provide affordable housing and read guidelines on how it can be accomplished. He said that it is not to dedicate property to build affordable housing, but to build it into a future development. He said this is not subsidized or low income housing, but affordable housing for teachers, firefighters, police officers, Town employees. He stated that they do not have a method to do this. He said if this can be worked out by pausing, then we can figure out affordable housing, schools and steps to Highway 41 widening.

Mr. Brimmer asked if the motion included townhomes.

Mr. Bustos stated that he is referring to apartment complexes.

Mr. Brimmer said that he does not disagree with Mr. Bustos' assessment and he did a great job summarizing the growth issues. He stated that his issue is the conclusion of how to solve this, because looking at the annual growth rate the reality is that the growth rate has stabilized and is beginning to go down. He stated that you would have to go back to 2011 to find a growth rate that is lower than where we are today. He stated that the Town needs to maintain some growth of approximately 2.9% which is healthy. He stated that the last time a moratorium was discussed growth was in the double digits. He said from the data standpoint it is not comparable. He stated that on the Permitted Dwelling Unit report from the Planning Department, the multi-family portion of those dwelling units permitted is 21% of all the permits or 235 units. He said if we want to impact traffic and schools, we should be looking at single family homes of 721

versus 235 apartments. He said that multi-family is not the issue. He stated that over the past few months, Council has approved at least four new single family development neighborhoods. He said by approving more single family homes, it is adding more impact on traffic and schools. He stated that the Town has attempted to keep a 70/30 balance between single family and multi-family, but the latest figures show 21% for multi-family which is below. He said this year, there has been zero multi-family dwelling units permitted. He said he does not disagree with Mr. Bustos' assessment, but does not believe that restricting across the board of multi-family is how we are going to there, but to take a broader view of all the development that is being approved. He stated that when a single family neighborhood is approved, whether 100 homes or 100 unit multi-family complex it is really the same impact. He stated that he is concerned because if there is a solution to control multi-family, it should be more specific and appropriate.

Mr. Bustos stated that Mr. Brimmer makes very good points and this is a first step of multi-family, but single family homes do need to be reviewed. He stated that the data indicating that the Town is not growing that quickly is flawed. He stated that 2.91% of 78,000 people are considerably more than 3% of 50,000. He said this is reminiscent of just before permit allocation came into existence. He said it gave the Town time to build Hungryneck Boulevard and the schools were able to get rid of their trailers. He said this moratorium is not forever but possibly 180 days, and once Council has the understanding of what needs to be done, perhaps a developer will come in and be able to produce affordable housing and senior housing. He stated that there was one developer that was able to accomplish this off of Gregorie Ferry Road by going to the bank and finding low cost financing, built the development, restricted it by salary and believes some Town employees moved into that development. He said it was the only time it has been done in this Town.

Mr. Brimmer said that he was not looking for a moratorium on single family homes, but his point was not pulling out one type of housing and treating it differently if we are looking at reigning in the number of rooftops. We should be looking at all types of housing. He stated that he would welcome an amendment to the motion if Mr. Bustos would like to put a timeline on the moratorium.

Mr. Bustos stated that he would add to the motion 180 days, but in 60 days if Council discovers something that will maintain the quality of life and grow the infrastructure, Council can do away with the moratorium and begin implementing those plans.

Mr. Haynie stated that he would amend his second to include Mr. Bustos' comments.

Mr. Carrier stated that he has attended the last two Housing Task Force meetings as an observer and no other Council member has attended. He stated that this is a very important Committee that has been formed and they are studying a lot of the demographics and asked Ms. Farrell to send all those demographics to Council and hopes they study them carefully, because they are current and very informative. He stated that the Town has a 2.91% growth rate and when he goes to the Municipal Association meetings in February and July and he discusses this growth rate people are stunned. He said there are 200 municipalities in this state that do not have a growth rate. He said that there is growth and people want to move here and we are so fortunate. He said that going back to his banker days he studied economics in college and said that the economy will take care of the Town's demand and supply. He said that developers will not develop if there is no demand. He said that right now, there is heavy demand. He said when you start putting a negative on this it will have nothing but a negative

impact on the economic development and businesses in this town. He said there is no way this is a positive. He stated that when you start something like this, it does not turn around. He said you can say 180 days or a year, but it just does not turn around, because we get that connotation that we are not open for business, which is sad, because the Town has worked very hard through the Economic Development Committee and Economic Development Officer to attract businesses. They will not come here when there is no growth no matter what the perks are of the beaches and Charleston. He stated that as far as affordability, the seniors have only one place to live and that is in multi-family housing. He said the Town's firefighters, police officers, public service people only have one place to live in this town, which is multi-family. He said they cannot afford to purchase a home, much less qualify for a mortgage. He said the average person cannot qualify. He stated that he is on the East Cooper Habitat Board and there are 90 applicants for 3 houses and asked Council to please think about this, because this is serious.

Mr. Smith stated that the school statistics are alarming and as a father, he understands the concerns in the school district. He asked Mr. Bustos if he has reached out to any of the school administration to hear their concerns specifically or was this based solely on Town produced reports.

Mr. Bustos stated that he acquired the figures from Mr. Chris Staubes.

Mr. Smith stated that he recognizes the concerns in the Town and traffic is always number one. He stated that in 1996, the growth rate was 4.5%; in 1997 it went to 4.9%, in 1999, to 7.39% and in 2000, almost doubled to 13.7%. He stated that there were significant growth rates back then. He stated in the past three years 3.84% in 2013, down to 3.43% in 2014 and in 2015 down

to 2.91%. He stated that although there is a decline, there are still some issues. He stated that Mr. Carrier's comments made sense that we should keep things in perspective. He stated that the Town should aggressively pursue the #1 concerns which is infrastructure and traffic, and that the Town should continue to fund these projects. He stated that the Town has the best staff leading the Transportation Department and the work has already been done. He asked Council to roll their sleeves up and find the funding to fund the roads that are unfunded starting with Highway 41. He stated that if you live in this Town you drive on all the roads. He stated that these are the issues that he would like to see a significant meaningful discussion built on is infrastructure. He stated that he will not be supporting this motion, but will absolutely support a discussion that deals with the issue starting with traffic.

Mr. Bustos stated that Mr. Smith makes a good point about funding and agrees that the Town should make an aggressive case to the State for funding. He stated that unfortunately this is not forthcoming. He stated that he believes Mr. Smith, at a Planning Committee meeting, stated that he did not agree with raising impact fees. He stated that this is an aggressive way to go over funding to mitigate development impacts on infrastructure. He stated that you cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Smith stated that he did say this in the Planning Committee and he has not voted for any tax or fee increase since his term in office and stated that he will never support a tax or fee increase in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Brimmer asked Ms. Farrell how many of the developments are reflected in the February report.

Ms. Farrell stated that not all are reflected. She stated that the permitted units are shown and will be added towards the growth

rate once they receive certificate of occupancy. She said those under site development will likely not be complete this calendar year. She stated that Planning does not include units in the growth rate until after they have received their Certificate of Occupancy.

Mayor Page asked if the Growth Management Plan calls for a ratio of multi-family to single family.

Ms. Farrell stated that she did not recall that this was specific in the Growth Management Plan; however, for many years the Town has looked at generally maintaining by policy a 70/30 ratio which was established in the 1980's and was a number that stayed with the Town. She said this is the reason we track this number as a matter of interest, going forward.

Mayor Page asked from a Planning point of view, if this was a number that was randomly selected or if it was a good planning practice number.

Ms. Farrell stated that it was a policy decision made in the 1980's and has continued forward. She stated that it is a number that is tracked for informational purposes. She stated that there is no legal requirement or anything within the zoning ordinances that would require the Town to maintain this ratio.

Mayor Page stated that there are no triggers in place for the Town to control multi-family housing. She suggested that instead of a moratorium, there should be a bigger discussion on a percentage or a more comprehensive view of housing in general.

Mr. Bustos stated that he believes there is one in the Comprehensive Plan and it is an 85/15 ratio of single family to multi-family.

Ms. Farrell stated that the Town has ratios they maintain and is not sure which one is in the Comprehensive Plan, but Planning does track single family to multi-family and if you look at everything that is currently built, the Town is maintaining a 73/26 ratio. She stated that even if they include everything that has been built and approved it will maintain the same ratio of 73/26 single family to multi-family.

Mayor Page stated that these are big decisions and she has not received any legal advice or any staff advice on what the possible repercussions of a movement such as this. She said there are two Council members that are not present this evening. She asked Legal Counsel for advice.

Mr. Pagliarini stated that he would provide comprehensive advice because there are a lot of moving parts in a detailed memorandum. He stated that currently, the Town has an ordinance that applies to this situation, 156.032, and the language is generally that a moratorium on development is justified in certain circumstances and can be implemented to prevent property owners from hindering and or circumventing the zoning process. He stated that right away, Council must look at the hindering or circumventing of the zoning process as the key. He stated that state law and the Town's ordinances are basically the same in that when there is such a suspension of one of the ordinances, there should be a defined end and a plan in the works moving forward to solve the problem. He stated that moratoriums are legal and allowed, but it must be under the right circumstance, which is moving forward, there must be a plan in place to solve it as well as a defined end.

Mayor Page asked if Legal Counsel is comfortable with a blanket moratorium without an idea of how Council may accomplish changes that Mr. Bustos is seeking.

Mr. Pagliarini stated that is what the ordinance suggests in that a moratorium may be implemented to prevent property owners from hindering and or circumventing the zoning process which is an important element.

Mr. Owens asked Ms. Farrell where the tracking is over the last five years as an average.

Ms. Farrell stated that there have been several relatively large apartment complexes, but does not have that figure at this time. She said just the three complexes The Haven, The Boulevard and River Walk are approximately 1,000.

Mr. Owens asked if it appears that it is trending upwards in the multi-family.

Ms. Farrell stated that this was the trend. She said the Town went through a long period of time where they did not build any multi-family which was followed by a period of time where almost every single apartment complex in the Town turned into condominiums. She said there weren't any rentals and then the Town hit a period of time where there was no growth of any kind. She said it went through a very quiet period before the three complexes just mentioned were built.

Mr. Owens stated that it appears that multi-family has been tracking upwards over the last five years. He stated that the 70/30 ratio and this has been enacted since the 1980's. He said with the amount of growth is there potential for a reduction in the percentages. He stated that the Town continues to be reactive instead of pro-active in the infrastructure which is a grave concern to everyone. He stated with the rate of growth, this needs to be revisited. He stated that for now, they are only asking for a 180 day moratorium to slow the process of the

multi-family curricula. He said that he would be supporting Mr. Bustos' motion.

Mayor Page stated that she does not believe the infrastructure can be built before people come to Mount Pleasant and is not able to tell the difference between what we are trying to exclude and what we are trying to include. She stated that she will not support a moratorium and does not believe it brings the community together or hears the voice of the whole community. She said she would be very cautious, based on the legal advice received from Mr. Pagliarini that Council is calling for a 180 day moratorium of multi-family building. She said she is not sure what will be accomplished, because she does not believe a road or school will be finished in 180 days.

Mr. Brimmer stated that he does not think the moratorium will solve the problems identified. He stated that it is more destructive to be approving projects and new neighborhoods at Ten Mile which draws traffic all the way through Town and does more damage to infrastructure and traffic than a 100 unit multi-family by the bridge. He stated that the issue is a more comprehensive look at Planning. He stated that if this means not building for six months and taking that time to think about it, which coincides with the work of the Workforce Housing Committee who are also exploring the options. He stated that he would support the motion to give time to think, although does not believe this is a solution. He said he would not be supporting it if the Town did not have 2,000 units currently in the process.

Mayor Page said the motion is for a 180 day moratorium on multi-family building. Before final reading, she would like to know what the plan will be going forward for the 180 days. She asked Ms. Farrell if she had clarity in the motion.

Mr. Farrell stated that she does not, because she has not heard any specific direction for the Planning Staff in terms of what staff is supposed to provide.

Mr. Bustos stated that he would be happy to do so. He said the pause of 180 days is to give the Town the opportunity to look at where we are today. He stated that Mr. Smith had important concerns regarding funding for infrastructure, discussions have taken place with the schools, but will provide an opportunity to see how to address the Town's infrastructure which has fallen behind. He stated that the answer may be at the end of 180 days that we cannot get there from here; however, does not want to create more of what is impacting the Town. He stated that he would encourage Economic Development be part of this plan moving forward. He stated that staff would need to work on when they predict the infrastructure will be able to digest not only what we have now, but what is being processed. He stated that Mr. Brimmer made a good point, that we may come to the analysis that single family developments are as large or larger than multi-family.

Mr. DeMoura said that staff's marching orders would be not to accept any new applications for building permits for multi-family structures.

Mr. Bustos stated that we need to tell applicants that the Town will not even accept their applications or paperwork.

Jimmy Bagwell, 41 Vincent Drive and stated that he has lived in Mount Pleasant for 67 years. He said he wanted to commend Councilman Bustos for having the courage to bring this to the public's eye tonight. He stated that Mr. Bustos is reflecting the will of the people that was reflected in the vote in last November's election. He said if you grow at 3% or 4% for the next 35 years, we will have approximately 230,000 people in the

Town. If we grow at 1.5%, we will have about 130,000 to 140,000 people in the Town. He said a few percentage points in the Town's growth at this point in the history of this Town make a big difference. He stated that we are going to ruin what has made Mount Pleasant such a great place to live if we continue to pile people and apartment complexes into the Town. He stated that we are draining lakes to build apartments now. He said the Town needs to look at single family growth as well as multi-family complexes. He said there are towns all over the country who have said "enough is enough" and resolved to save their quality of life. He stated that he commends Council for taking a stand and Mr. Bustos for having the courage to bring this forward.

Pam Ireland, 820 Fiddlers Point Lane and said she understands and supports the idea of affordable and workplace housing. She asked how many of the units that are "in the pipeline" are affordable housing and what is affordable housing. She asked if the Town has a definition and is it up to \$600 for a studio, up to \$900 for a one bedroom. She said she keeps hearing this term "affordable housing" but it is a completely amorphous term. She stated that if the Town has 2,000 units in the pipeline and they will all start at \$1,500 or \$1,800 a month, it does nothing to solve the problem with commuting issues, affordable or senior housing. She is in hopes that Council will support the motion to take a break and think about the Town's plans going forward.

Patrick Arnold, 25 Beverly Road said that he serves as the Government Affairs Director for the Charleston Trident Association of Realtors. He stated as the voice of the real estate industry of the lowcountry, they cannot support the arbitrary ban on multi-family apartments, the ban on ADU's, the proposed changes to the overlay district or tax increases in the form of developmental impact fees. He stated that Mount Pleasant has a major affordable housing problem and Council is debating a ban on the only affordable housing options in the

Town. He stated that this is supply and demand and the only way to bring down the prices is allow them to come online. What does is say about a town that is willing to ban something that its teachers, first responders and elderly or anyone who cannot afford a half a million dollar mortgage, desperately need. Regardless of anyone's opinion on the aesthetics of apartments or ADU's or how it affects the character of the Town, all experts agree that Mount Pleasant desperately needs more apartments and housing options. He stated that he is asking for Council to put personal preferences ahead of real work problems facing the citizens. He stated that if traffic is Council's concern, the experts agree that the town does not have too many people, but too many people commuting to and from the Town, because they are priced out of the market. He stated that he has heard that housing is never going to be affordable in Mount Pleasant, which is a dangerous way to look at the Town's problems and a perfect way to create a housing crisis. He stated on behalf of the real estate community and the Realtors Association, he would like to urge Council to reject this plan to make housing more unaffordable.

Karen Flores and lived in Mount Pleasant for 54 years and does not understand a lot about the debate, but does understand supply and demand. She stated that she counted 2,552, which are ten developments. She stated that when she drives around Town, there are a lot more than ten developments going on in Mount Pleasant. She stated that there are likely two people to a unit which doubles the number of people and cars on the road. She said traffic is horrendous. She stated that the Town needs to stop all the development. She stated that the Town is not structured for it. She stated that the best thing going on in the Town is Shem Creek and look what has happened there; it's ridiculous!

Barry Wolff, 1468 Pocahontas Street stated that this is what Charleston Trident Association Realtors is promoting. He stated that none of this is affordable housing so let's not dumb down real estate prices in Mount Pleasant, because it is not going to happen. He stated that this is the February 15th report by the Town and he did the math quickly, which reflects approximately 6,400 housing units and 2,600 of these are apartments, which is 40% of the total. He stated that the rest is divided between single family and townhomes. He stated that there are 1,400 single family homes out of this figure and the balance of 2,000+ are townhomes. He stated that townhomes and single family homes equal density no matter how you slice it.

Mr. Owens stated that Charleston County's median home prices for February, 2016 were \$310,000 and in Mount Pleasant area 1, they were \$465,000 and in area 2, they were \$515,000.

Mr. Brimmer, Mr. Bustos, Mr. Haynie and Mr. Owens voted in favor. Mr. Carrier, Mr. Smith and Mayor Page were opposed. Mr. Gawrych and Mr. Santos were absent. Motion passes 4-3.

6. Consideration of removing the three foot setback allowance for accessory structures.

Mr. Bustos stated there are three foot setbacks for accessory dwelling units (ADU's) and some of them go up to 25 feet and tower over neighboring backyards. He stated that he would like to see a 6 foot setback so that people that want to work on their ADU's do not have to go into their neighbor's yard to get to their unit. He stated that 6 feet is a good minimum rather than 3 feet.

Mr. Bustos put this in the form of a motion; seconded by Mr. Owens.

Mr. Carrier stated that Ms. Farrell made a point in the Committee meeting that it would exclude the possible installation of other accessory amenities in the backyard such as pools.

Ms. Farrell stated that she would like to clarify this. She stated when Mr. Bustos made this motion originally in the Planning Committee she understood the motion to mean that he was potentially proposing that any accessory structures would have to match the setbacks of the principal dwelling which normally for a backyard in R1 would be 30 feet. She made the comment and sought clarification with Mr. Bustos if that was his intent; however, he explained otherwise.

Mr. Bustos stated that if it is greater in other places for neighborhoods with HOA requirements that is acceptable; however, believes there should be a minimum of 6 feet. He stated that accessory structures are just too close to property lines and in some areas, lots are small and people want to have an accessory structure such as a garden shed or garage and believes that six feet is reasonable.

Mr. Farrell stated that her question for clarification is if this is intended to apply to all accessory structures such as a garden shed that it be a minimum of 6 feet.

Mr. Bustos responded in the affirmative and said it would give residents an area to get behind a shed rather than it being right up against a fence, or if they want to go on the roof, they have to stand a ladder in the neighbor's yard to do so.

Mr. Carrier said he would like this put on record as it was publically posted in the *Post and Courier* several months ago that one of the "Save Shem Creek" board members was very vocal about an ADU in his neighbor's backyard overlooking into his

yard. He stated that he believes this is where this comes from unless he stands corrected and believes it is totally unnecessary.

Mr. Bustos stated that Mr. Carrier is incorrect and that this comes from living on King Street and walking around and seeing some of the structures right up against the fence. He said some of them are very tall and pictures were posted on Facebook in their yard.

Mr. Carrier stated that he walks in the same area as Mr. Bustos and that he has not seen a bad one yet and most ADU's are very attractive. He does not believe that they need any setback lines other than what is required by the Town. He said that most are in l'On or the Old Village and the ones in the Old Village are nicely done, because they have to go through a review process with the Old Village Historic District Commission.

Mr. Smith asked Ms. Farrell how long have the current setbacks been in place.

Ms. Farrell said there are two parts to the answer. She said the 3 foot setback was in the ordinance already for some of the Town's zoning districts that allow smaller lots such as RPH, now called R4. She said that this was in existence as long as she has known. She said in 2007 they adopted what is called a SR2 Overlay District which applies to the Indian Village of Mount Pleasant and it is mirrored for what is allowed for the RPH district which is where the 3 foot setback became applied in that area. She said the majority of this property is zoned R2 and the SR2 Overlay District sits on top and allows for a modification to setbacks so that portion of Mount Pleasant – Old Mount Pleasant – it has been in existence for approximately 9 years and did already exist for some developments that had patio homes.

Barry Wolff, 1468 Pocahontas Street in the SR2 Overlay District and said what Ms. Farrell stated is partly his issue and what Mr. Bustos sees walking around the village. He stated that this has the effect of clustering these structures in a traditional 1950's / 1960's ranch single family district and this is the problem he has with it.

Jimmy Bagwell, 41 Vincent Drive stated that he is opposed to ADU's in general. He stated that there is a piece of property on McCants Drive that is a corner property and a lot next door to it. He said the lot next door was purchased by an individual and he bought the property on the corner. He subdivided the original lot he bought and got three lots and now he is building three houses where there used to be two and in addition to those three houses, he has also applied for an ADU in the backyard of each house. He said where there used to be two houses, there are six living units. He said multiply the number of cars and people that will be living there. He said when you begin doing this all over the Town it changes the character and nature of the neighborhoods. He stated that ADU's should be banned altogether and said this Council needs to take a hard look at this. He stated that regarding the incident Mr. Carrier was referring, he stood in the backyard of his friend who woke up one morning to an ADU that popped up in his neighbor's backyard and was 3 feet from his fence. He said where there used to be privacy in his backyard, it is now gone. He said he did not count on the ADU being there when he purchased his property. He said that ADU's are wrong in this town.

Mayor Page stated for clarification, Mr. Bustos would like to remove the three foot setback allowance.

Mr. Bustos stated that he would like to establish a minimum six foot setback.

Ms. Farrell showed the current text on the screen and stated that if Council directs this to proceed, it will go to the Planning Commission. Staff would remove what is highlighted in red.

Accessory Structure Setback

Current Regulations

- (1) They are not erected or placed within six feet of the side or rear property lines; provided, however, **that in the R-4 and SR2-OD use districts, the side and rear yard setback shall not be less than three feet;**
- (2) They are no closer than 15 feet to the principal dwelling unit on the adjoining property; provided, however, **that in the R-4 and SR2-OD Zoning Districts, the separating distance shall not be less than six feet;**
- (3) If located in the front yard, the setback requirements of that zoning district must be maintained;

Mr. DeMoura stated that this would not happen right away. He stated that this would be Council's permission to direct legal staff to prepare an ordinance to be sent to the Planning Commission because it affects the zoning code.

Mr. Brimmer, Mr. Bustos, Mr. Haynie and Mr. Owens were in favor. Mr. Carrier, Mr. Smith and Mayor Page were opposed. Mr. Gawrych and Mr. Santos were absent. Motion passes 4-3.

7. Consideration to hold the Coleman/Ben Sawyer Boulevard overlay district in abeyance until traffic and density issues are addressed.

Mr. Bustos stated that there are areas in the Coleman/Ben Sawyer Overlay District with up to sixteen units per acre and combined with other pieces of land, apartments and multi-family over retail establishments that he believes should not be

there, but does not know how to undo this process, unless the Town holds in abeyance the Coleman/Ben Sawyer Overlay District. He stated that Council needs to figure out the traffic and density issues. He said for clarity, abeyance for 180 days to see how this is going to impact the Town.

Mr. Bustos put this in the form of a motion; seconded by Mr. Haynie.

Mr. Haynie asked if this affects residential and not commercial.

Mr. Bustos stated that if someone comes in with a clean commercial development request, he sees no reason why this could not be considered. He said that it is the density and traffic issues that need to be addressed.

Mr. Haynie said that retail businesses such as restaurants, offices, and any economic development may continue; this is just addressing density.

Mr. Bustos responded in the affirmative. He said that developments submitted with apartments on top may not be included in the motion made in item #5 and thinks there are differences.

Mayor Page asked Mr. Bustos to define the differences.

Mr. Bustos stated that multi-family developments, while you could consider apartments over retail as multi-family, he does not believe they would be the same as those in item #5 which is multi-family developments, but they would still equate to multi-family along Coleman Boulevard.

Mr. Haynie asked if Mr. Bustos meant mixed-use.

Mr. Bustos responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Brimmer stated that he is not clear on the abeyance and asked if it meant that the zoning reverts back to pre-urban corridor with all of the residential that is zoned residential will go back to commercial for the next six month.

Mr. Bustos responded in the affirmative and as a by-product of this he would say so, because the Town needs commercial.

Mr. Brimmer stated that it concerns him because commercial projects tend to generate more traffic than residential, so he is not certain this is a solution to deal with the traffic issue.

Mr. Bustos stated that commercial and true economic development is needed and it is his opinion that the Town has rezoned too much commercial light-industrial to residential.

Mr. Brimmer stated that he is not disagreeing but believes Council needs to review the corridor, because he has concerns about the vision of the corridor. He said he has concerns about a 6 month abeyance, or lifting of the zoning, and then having discussions and change it again. He asked Ms. Farrell what is included in an abeyance for 6 months.

Mr. Bustos stated that this is not a moratorium, but just holding in abeyance. He said that during this time, if there are projects that come and if they doing what is not necessarily what is in the Coleman Overlay District, but looks good as a commercial project, then the old zoning could be applied. He said there are things along Coleman Boulevard that are ill-defined. He said a specific example on Chuck Dawley where the family came in and said they are only going to build 44 units, but when asked to deed restrict the front 4 acres that were zoned for 16 units per acre, the attorney refused. He said when this property is sold, the developer will come in and want his 96 units because the front half is in the Overlay District resulting in 64 units and it was rezoned in the back from R1 to R4 which created another number of units. He said that he fully expects Council will see the developer come back and say he wants his 96 units.

Mr. Brimmer said if this passes, what will be different between now and six months. What kind of projects will be denied that would not be denied today, or allowed that would not be allowed.

Mr. Bustos stated the projects with the apartments over retail.

Mr. Carrier asked Mr. Bustos how this would affect the CRAB, because the whole design of the CRAB (Coleman Boulevard Revitalization Advisory Board) was for mixed use for developers to be able to have retail, but to use the 2nd and 3rd floors for residential. He asked Mr. Bustos if his intent is to do away with the CRAB recommendations.

Mr. Bustos said to hold them in abeyance, yes.

Mr. Owens said that in taking a look at this in a broad based, he is not sure what going forward, differentiates the Coleman/Ben Sawyer Boulevard Overlay in a 6 month period than what has already been agreed to as far as a moratorium goes. He said coupled with what has taken place recently with the Bids and Purchases rejecting the bids that were on the Coleman Revitalization, how it would differentiate by putting this issue in abeyance.

Mr. Bustos said there are several parts to this and the bids that came in so high for Coleman Boulevard is part of this. He said that the Town is not going to be able to do the public part of Coleman Boulevard, because the Town does not have the funding, which goes back to the Transportation funding situation. He said that this may be bigger than just holding the design in abeyance. He stated that we need to couple this with the whole Coleman Boulevard construction. He said if we cannot do our part, he does not know if the Town can expect anyone else to do their part. He said he does not believe the funding is there to do this. He said the whole Coleman/Ben Sawyer Boulevard Overlay District is based on the Town doing certain things as the Town's part. He stated that the Town is discovering that they are not able to do their part, at least not anytime soon. He said to do this and have an idea of doing these things concurrently makes sense.

Mr. Haynie stated that as a member of the Transportation Committee, the details discussed about Coleman, he was the one vote against just picking up where we left off when bids got rejected. He said he does not believe the Town has a handle yet on where on that is going, what the phases would be, when and how we would get the drainage in, whether we will have a divided median. He said as a member of the Transportation Committee and with so much being in flux about the future, he thinks this is a wise planning move. For one thing, it has to do with traffic and for the other it has to do with density. He asked how much new impervious surfaces are going to be affecting the drainage, when will it get put in. He said we do not have the answer to this and to continue on a plan that had counted on all this being approved – the roundabout and accompanying drainage – and now because of the bids this is not going to happen. He thinks it is unwise to consider moving forward when you do not know where you are going. He said that is why he supports this motion as a member of the Transportation Committee.

Mayor Page stated that she did the data and this evening a motion will be presented to move forward with the phased approach. She will support the phased approach to Coleman Boulevard because we have discussed how important it is. She stated that the drainage is a key component. She said that Mr. Bustos is basically asking for something that has been worked on for almost twenty years now to be indefinitely put on hold without any rationale or without any legal discussion or ramifications or unintended consequences. She said she will have a very difficult time supporting Mr. Bustos' motion.

Mr. Bustos stated that he disagrees and believes his rationale is very clear. He takes exception to the fact that he would speak with no rationale to what he is saying.

Mr. Owens asked if his intent is to put this in abeyance so that we can take a look at this phasing process going forward.

Mr. Bustos stated there are a lot of things that cannot move with the Town's infrastructure and there are some things that can move and he is saying that we need to match these things and to make certain that we can move forward or not, because we have zoning based on infrastructure that we may not be able to do. He said not to belabor the subject, but his answer is yes.

Mr. Smith stated that Coleman/Ben Sawyer Boulevard Overlay District, any projects that come before the Town that are not solely commercial based will not be considered in Mr. Bustos' motion.

Ms. Farrell stated that she needs clarification on a few items as it relates to this. She said there are a lot of things that come straight to the department or to the Design Review Board and do not come to Council when it comes to that area of Town. Therefore, she will need clarification on this. She will also need clarification if this only applies to the Coleman/Ben Sawyer portion of the Urban Corridor. She said Mr. Bustos mentioned Chuck Dawley earlier, and Johnnie Dodds.

Mr. Smith stated that he is gravely concerned about the unintended consequences.

Jimmy Bagwell, 41 Vincent Drive stated that Mr. Bustos' rationale is perfect. He said there was a highway project that was estimated at \$11 or \$12 million dollars that came in at \$19 or \$20 million, so the Town cannot build that. He said he heard this body a few months ago say that they could not phase this project in and had to be done all at one time. He said, now you are saying you can phase it. He said that Mr. Bustos' is right and the Town needs to take a look at what they want to do and what they have the funding to do and move forward very slowly. He said that Coleman Boulevard is not going anywhere and is not going to fall apart in the next six months and said the Town really needs to think this through and make it right. He said another thing Mr. Bustos is right about, we need commercial development and we have two very nice commercial

developments taking place on Coleman Boulevard right now; one where the Fondue Your restaurant used to be, and the other one on the corner of Lansing and Coleman. He said there are commercial developers out there that would love to have an opportunity to do something on Coleman Boulevard. He said the Town also needs jobs on Coleman so that the people who want to live there will have a place to work. He said he supports the motion and thinks it is a wise direction.

Sarah “Sally” Jacobs, 1152 Village Creek Lane said she thinks abeyance is a very vague term and would be very hesitant to have her Town Council voting for an abeyance.

Mr. Brimmer asked Mr. Pagliarini what the legal definition of abeyance would be.

Mr. Pagliarini stated that it means to hold back; essentially it means to suspend the existing ordinance.

Mr. Brimmer asked what would be in its place.

Mr. Pagliarini stated that there is nothing in its place.

Mr. Brimmer asked how it would work legally to have property parcels without any zoning.

Mr. Pagliarini stated that if he understands it correctly, in the overlay would revert back to the underlying zoning requirements that we currently have. He said while there is a default position, he does not know there is a replacement. He believes these are two different things.

Mr. Bustos stated that it just means to hold off on.

Mr. Bustos, Mr. Haynie and Mr. Owens voted in favor. Mr. Brimmer, Mr. Carrier, Mr. Smith and Mayor Page were opposed. Mr. Gawrych and Mr. Santos were absent. Motion fails 3-4.

B. OLD BUSINESS

- 1. Final Reading:** An Ordinance providing for the annexation of an approximately 0.542 acre tract of land comprised of three parcels, located on U.S. Highway 17 North, identified by TMS Nos. 558-00-00-154, 558-00-00-157 and 558-00-00-331, and depicted on a plat recorded by the Charleston County RMC Office in Book AP, Page 026 and Book S09, Page 0317. (Ord. No. 16020)

Mr. Smith moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Carrier. All voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read *FINAL READING BY TITLE ONLY*. This Ordinance *SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

- 2. Final Reading:** An Ordinance providing for the *First Amendment* to the Johnson Development PD-MU-SU, Planned Development-Mixed Use Suburban-Urban District (Ordinance 14084). (Ord. No. 16021)

Ms. Farrell stated that Council had first reading on this ordinance last month and two issues that were brought forward were to clarify that the building height request only applies to the grocery store and also that the parking ratio that was originally submitted will apply to the entirety of the stores. Therefore, staff has prepared an ordinance that incorporates what Council indicated at the last meeting with respect to those; therefore, this would be incorporated as part of the final reading. She said the other item that came up at the last Council meeting was sweetgrass basket stands on the property. She said what the developer has indicated to staff and provided documentation is they would provide two brand new stands that will be incorporated in the commercial development. She stated that the exact location would be determined during the design review process. She said that the developers forwarded an

agreement to staff with the property owners with a commitment that those stands would be available to those families that currently own the property. She stated that this should satisfy the concerns that Council had at the last meeting.

Mr. Carrier moved for approval as amended as stated by the Planning Director; seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Bustos stated regarding Ms. Richardson's point, there was discussion that the developer would not be required to do anything across the street that would impact them.

Ms. Farrell stated that the modifications to the Weaver Circle area were resolved through the impact assessment approval last month.

Myra Richardson, 2755 Earl Johnson Lane stated that she is commenting about the sweetgrass basket stands and stated that they will be difficult to access. She said that it is not located on the highway. She said that the proposed sweetgrass basket stands will not accommodate the number of people that will be using them. She said there are more than two stands on the development. She said that she went to the Town Center and saw the sweetgrass basket pavilion there and the occupants stated that there is not enough room. She said she walked the area, which is approximately 30'x30' and said the area is much bigger than this and can accommodate at least four sweetgrass basket stands. She said there are already five people using the existing stand and the stand that is on the Bull tract, there is another. So, there are six people using the stand. She said the question is, how will the public get to those stands? Is there a curb cut for them to drive off of Highway 17 to get to the stands? Are they putting a hedge in front of the stands and two huge oak trees on the other side? She said it will basically leave them sitting there surrounded by trees and no one will be able

to see them unless you are coming into the development and going through the parking lot, you will not get to the stand. She said no one will want to make the effort to get there.

Russ Seamon, Seamon Whitesides said that they put a lot of thought into this. He said they found two sweetgrass basket areas and proposed two new buildings that would replace what are currently open air stands; one with a picnic table and the other is 2'x4' where you could hang baskets. He said they are greatly improving the conditions that are there. He said there is more than adequate parking in the parking lot and the curb cut will be there so parking will be available for the sweetgrass basket stands. He said they are located in the green space under the oaks right along Highway 17. He said they are fine with adjusting the location and will address this through the Design Review Board (DRB). He provided Council with an agreement that has been signed by nine of the property owners stating that they are in agreement with the conceptual plan. These are family members of properties along the frontage that are being purchased.

Mr. Carrier asked if buyers would be able to pull off of Highway 17 and get out of traffic.

Mr. Seamon stated that he is not sure if DOT would allow them to do any improvement along Highway 17 to allow people to pull right off of the highway. He said that they are able to provide access to the sweetgrass basket stands through their site.

Mr. Carrier asked how they accessed prior.

Mr. Seamon stated there were residential curb cuts.

All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read *FINAL READING BY TITLE ONLY*. This Ordinance *SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

- 3. Final Reading:** An Ordinance to zone NC, Neighborhood Commercial District, an approximately 0.39 acre tract of land located at 1375 Old Georgetown Road, identified by TMS No. 559-13-00-027, and depicted on a plat recorded by the Charleston County RMC Office in Book G, Page 049. (Ord. No. 16024)

Mr. Smith moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Bustos. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read *FINAL READING BY TITLE ONLY*. This Ordinance *SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

- 4. Final Reading:** An Ordinance providing for an *amendment* to the Belle Hall Planned Development District Ordinance pertaining to an approximately 16.33 Acre tract of land comprised of two parcels identified by TMS Nos. 540-00-00-032 and 540-00-00-100, and depicted on a plat recorded by the Charleston County RMC Office in Book ED, Page 045 and Book EE, Page 244, pertaining to the Commercial Development Standards. (Ord. No. 16027)

Mr. Bustos moved for approval as amended; seconded by Mr. Smith. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read *FINAL READING BY TITLE ONLY*. This Ordinance *SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

- 5. Final Reading:** An Ordinance to amend Zoning Code Section 156.224 (F) of Chapter 156 of the Town of Mount Pleasant Code of Ordinances, pertaining to replacement requirements for trees

removed from property containing a use classified in the submittal requirements table as “Other Land Uses.” (Ord. No. 16028)

Mr. Smith moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Bustos. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read *FINAL READING BY TITLE ONLY*. This Ordinance *SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

Mayor Page called for a short break. Council went on break at 9:19 p.m. and reconvened at 9:24 p.m.

Mr. Brimmer said for clarification, the moratorium vote that passed this evening, does it not include Multi-Family development on Coleman Boulevard, and does it include or not include any mixed use development across town.

Mr. Bustos stated that it says “multi-family development apartment complexes” and said that there is a difference three or four houses on top of retail. He said this addresses multi-family development apartment complexes.

Mr. Brimmer said that it would not include any mixed use commercial.

Mr. Bustos stated that this is correct.

IX. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. [Accommodations Tax Advisory Committee](#)

Mr. Carrier stated that the Committee did meet and reviewed the proposed the FY 2016/2016 ATAC budget and recommended it for approval to the Budget Committee of Council. The Committee was

reminded that the Farmers Market is now open every Tuesday and the Blessing of the Fleet and Seafood Festival is on Sunday, April 24th. He stated that the next East Cooper Hospitality Alliance meeting is April 14th beginning at 4:00 p.m., followed by the networking social from 5 – 7 p.m. to celebrate the reopening of Alhambra Hall.

B. Bids & Purchases Committee

Mr. Owens stated that the Committee unanimously approved the recommendation to reject the bids associated with the Coleman Drainage and Revitalization project.

C. Economic Development Committee

1. Approval to establish a fish market at Mount Pleasant Farmers Market

Mr. Smith stated that this item was addressed prior to Planning New Business.

2. Approval of a Multi/County Park Extension

Mr. Smith stated that this item requires action from full Council to approve the Resolution to extend Mount Pleasant's Multi County Park Designations to include Hubner's expansion.

Mr. Smith moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Carrier. All present voted in favor.

D. Education Committee (No Meeting)

Report

E. Finance Committee

1. Approval of a Community Investment Policy that would govern the allocation of public funds to outside agencies (See Council New Business Item XI.A.1.)

2. Approval to extend a lease agreement with Trident Technical College for property located at 1004 Hungry Neck Boulevard (See Council New Business Item XI.A.6.)
3. Approval of Health Services Fund Resolution (See Council New Business Item XI.A.2.)
4. Approval of Debt Service Fund Resolution (See Council New Business Item XI.A.3)
5. Approval of Budget Policy Resolution (See Council New Business Item XI.A.4)
6. Report

F. [Fire Committee](#)

1. Approval to apply for a FEMA port security grant

Mr. Owens stated that the Committee met and requested approval to apply for a 2016 Port Security Grant for \$64,000 with a \$24,425 match from the Town. The total amount of the grant is \$85,000 with the grant providing 75% and the Town 25%. The grant will be used to purchase:

- ✓ JUNO handheld Chemical Detector (\$17,000)
- ✓ Raman Chemical Identifier (\$33,000)
- ✓ Kohler 5 kW generator (M501) (\$12,000)
- ✓ FLIR Thermal Imager (M501) (\$10,000)
- ✓ FLIR First mate (M501) (\$7000)
- ✓ Stabilizing binoculars (M501) (\$1000)
- ✓ Side Scan Sonar (M501) (\$2000)
- ✓ Titanium Litter (M501) (\$2500)
- ✓ Rescue Can (M501) (\$1200)

Mr. Owens placed this in the form of a motion; seconded by Mr. Smith. All present voted in favor.

2. Report

TYPE	NUMBER OF CALLS
Fires	27
Medical	453
Other	234
TOTAL	714

G. Human Resources

1. Resolution to amend Human Resource Guidelines (See Council New Business Item XI.A.5)
2. Report

H. Patriots Point Development Authority

Mac Burdette, Executive Director of Patriots Point thanked Council for the opportunity to discuss the proposed lease with Bennett Hospitality. He stated forty years ago when Patriots Point Development Authority (PPDA) was established by an act of the General Assembly, it was done so that they would be self-sustaining. He stated that they have done a good job and the last time that PPDA received an annual appropriation from the General Assembly was in 1986 which was for \$300,000 a year. He said since then, they have lived off what they have earned. He said one of the things the General Assembly did back in 1975 was to provide a generous amount of land that could be used to help with sustaining the operation of the Naval Maritime Museum for the State of South Carolina. He stated that they are in a position now to put forth a development proposal with what they consider to be a partner. He stated that approximately sixteen months ago, they did a nationwide request for proposals trying to find the right developer for Patriots Point; one developer. He said they were very fortunate that Mike Bennett of Bennett Hospitality won. He said that his reputation is very good in this community; he is local and still owns

the first building he ever bought when he was 24 years old. He sees Patriots Point as being a legacy that he will be able to pass down to his children and wants to make sure it is done right. He said that what money comes out of this and the investments he will make will stay in the Charleston Community and the State of South Carolina and not go elsewhere. He said they have worked on this very complicated lease for fourteen months and it is likely the most complicated lease in the history of the State of South Carolina. He said it is very important at this time to ensure that Council knows that PPDA knows that as this process goes forward and gets approved by the PPDA board, it must then go to Columbia to be approved by the Joint Bond Review Committee and then by the State Fiscal Accountability Party, which is the old Budget Control Board. He said there is still a ways to go in this process; however, they do hope this will happen in early June. He said, ultimately, before anything can be developed at Patriots Point, Mr. Bennett and Patriots Point will come before the various committees and commissions of the Town of Mount Pleasant to seek approvals for what Mr. Bennett would like to develop. Mr. Bennett has proposed through his RFP's a mixed use development and the PPDA Board and given tentative approval of the concept of the mixed use development. He said this is a concept and will certainly change to some extent. He said Mr. Bennett's lease will be approximately 61 acres of land. He stated that Patriots Point has done more than its share to establish open space on its property. He stated that PPDA has 300 acres of land, 200 of which is open space. He stated that two thirds of their property is open space. He stated that this must all adhere to the rules and regulations, zoning, etc., of the Town of Mount Pleasant. He said through the leases and this particular lease for the Bennett proposal, they do require that the developer would have to pay a fee in lieu of taxes otherwise there will be no taxes accrued for the Town of Mount Pleasant, to Charleston County or the Charleston County School Board. He said this goes back decades with the Town of Mount Pleasant when they established a very good working relationship with Patriots Point to

make sure that when the property did develop, that there would be a fee in lieu of taxes required by the leases of Patriots Point being State property which is not taxable. So, the Town will benefit for many decades to come assuming it all works out. He said it is a ninety-nine year lease and will be a fifteen to seventeen year build out, allowing Mr. Bennett a two year due diligence period. He would expect this development to begin, assuming everything is approved, sometime in the next two years. He stated that the mixed use development is hotels, restaurants, offices, shops, stores of various types and the only multi-family that the board has advised Mr. Bennett that they would approve is if it was integrated into the overall development, not as a big box standalone apartment. He said that it could be units above shops. He stated that they are not interested in developing a multi-family large complex. He stated that certainly a large office building would be within the vision, because they would like to see jobs created here beyond those at shops, restaurants and hotels. He stated that Mr. Bennett would invest somewhere between \$350 to \$400 Million dollars at Patriots Point which is a sizeable amount and would benefit everyone. He said that the Mayor sits on the PPDA Board as an ex-officio voting board member as all Mayors have by state statute. He said it is a peculiar position for any of the Mayors to be put in, because from time to time the Mayor has his or her responsibility to the Town and their responsibility to PPDA as an ex officio voting member. He said the purpose of putting the Mayor on the Board is to make sure that input is given to the PPDA Board from the Town's perspective. He said the Mayor does this on a regular basis. Mr. Burdette stated that Mr. Bennett did acquired the lease to parcel E which was under lease to a company out of Philadelphia and Atlanta and they hold the lease on the golf course. He stated that Mr. Bennett acquired that lease very recently and very likely he will be looking to request a zoning change to a hotel. He said right now it allows condos or offices.

Mayor Page thanked Mr. Burdette and asked Mr. Burdette to show Council where the potential Medal of Honor Museum will be placed.

Mr. Burdette stated that it would be approximately 7.2 acres and pointed to 7.2 acres on other side of the road from the Cold War Memorial, and they will also be coming back to the board to request two additional acres. He stated that he has heard people wonder if the funds will ever be raised to build the museum. He stated that General Darwin Simpson who is the Chairman of the Medal of Honor Museum Foundation will make this happen and it will be a great addition to the State, our County, our Town and Patriots Point. He stated that the Medal of Honor Museum is a \$1 per year for 99 years tenant of PPDA and they will do whatever they can to support and assist them.

Mayor Page stated that this is a \$100 million project and Mr. Bennett's potential project is \$350 to \$400 million; therefore, combined, this is a \$500 million dollar project.

Mr. Burdette stated that his job is to make sure that he carries out the Charter of the State of South Carolina Patriots Point and that is to make sure that they can be self-sustaining in terms of 100 years. He said that he has three 70 year old warships that are sitting in salt water and they have done an environmental assessment of the Yorktown and they are going to need to spend approximately \$60 million dollars on the Yorktown in twenty years and every twenty years they will spend an additional \$20 million, so over 100 years they will need to spend approximately \$300 million on the Yorktown alone. He said that all of their land must work for them. He said that he was part of working out with Council and the Mayor at that time the lease for thirty-six acres of prime real estate that is enjoyed by the Town of Mount Pleasant Recreation Department and the College of Charleston's Athletic Department. He stated that

they get \$145,000 a year for the next 45 years for this land. He said that Mr. Bennett may consider a sublease, but is certain it will be at market value. He said that PPDA believes they have given away enough land to the Medal of Honor Museum and the College of Charleston/Town of Mount Pleasant and have done their part. He stated that taxpayers do not want to have to fund three warships for decades. This is not supposed to work this way, so the land must work for PPDA. He said that he is sure that the Town understands and appreciates what PPDA does for the Town in terms of revenue. He said that approximately 500,000 people a year visit Patriots Point and Spirit Line Cruises to go to Ft. Sumter a year. He said that this is a big economic impact on the Town. He believes it is important to continue the economic development partnership with the Town, but more than that, within 25 years, only 5% of American families will have a living member of a family that has actually ever served in the military. He stated that it is important to have places like Patriots Point to ensure we teach future generations the values that we hold so dear. He said there is only one reason PPDA needs to develop this property and that is to sustain the Naval Maritime Museum perpetually.

Mr. Haynie asked if the primary way to get there from here, is the 99 year ground lease from Bennett, or if there are other kickers.

Mr. Burdette stated that the ground leases along with the leases they currently have, they believe that within fifteen years, they will generate close to \$6 million per year. They will use that as a Capital Fund to actually sell bonds and use that to pay the debt service on the bonds in \$20 million increments and pay it back over a five to seven year period of time and then roll another one over. He said they would isolate that money from these leases only for the preservation of the ships and the pier.

Mr. Smith congratulated Mr. Burdette on the great success and wished him much luck securing everything. He said it will certainly be a significant economic impact. He said it would be incredible to have Highway 17 be the Americas Highway or some type of Freedom Highway leading up to the crown jewel of the Medal of Honor Museum, which is the only one in the country. He said in the Medal of Honor Museum website, it has been promoted and discuss a 128 foot height in the building they are raising the \$100 million dollars. He said that Mr. Bagwell and Mr. McQueeny were co-sponsors along with several others at the Medal of Honor Gala event. He said they showed them a virtual tour, so everyone knows what the building looks like and what the intentions are. He said they have seen and heard significant movement from the community and Council members that there will be no exceptions to the height ordinance. He said he recently learned that the height area at that particular site is not 75 feet, but actually 50 feet.

Mr. Burdette stated that there is no zoning on this property, so they will have to come back and obtain zoning on this property just as Mr. Bennett must do.

Mr. Smith stated that he would like to go on the record to say that he hopes that the Town of Mount Pleasant is not humiliated after a \$100 million dollar national fundraising effort, when all this information has been communicated, that we do not do not allow the museum to be built. He stated that he will be supporting this effort because they deserve it.

Mr. Burdette stated that Mr. Simpson respects the Town's process and has been a major player in the development of Spartanburg, SC and was going to run for Mayor there a few years ago and decided to do this instead. He believes in local government and the process and will find him incredibly cooperative. He stated that PPDA is the MOH's landlord and will support them.

Mayor Page asked Council members how long has it been since any of them have visited Patriots Point. She said that Mr. Burdette has brought in some wonderful programs.

Mr. Burdette stated that they will launch their astronomy and 3D virtual reality program in approximately a month. He stated that they tested it out on some graduate students to ensure it works seamlessly.

I. [Planning Committee](#)

1. Consideration of Ordinance regulating mobile businesses

Mr. Brimmer stated that staff reviewed with the Committee a draft ordinance regulating Mobile Retail Vendors. The Committee unanimously recommended that staff proceed with the public hearing process.

Mr. Brimmer put this in the form of a motion to go to the Planning Commission for a Public Hearing; seconded by Mr. Carrier.

Mayor Page asked Legal Counsel if we have an Ordinance then peddling mobile businesses is allowed as governed by the Ordinance.

Mr. Pagliarini asked if this was based on the draft ordinance that was prepared in Committee. He stated that it would be permitted with the restrictions in the ordinance.

Mayor Page stated that she has reservations about the ordinance and encouraging mobile business. She said she has reservations about opening the door to mobile vending business. She said there is a peddler law on the book. She said she will not be supporting the motion.

Mr. Brimmer stated that this ordinance was based on the mobile food truck ordinance so there are those restrictions. Some of those concerns were raising in Committee as well and were adequately described and explained.

Mayor Page opposed. All others present voted in favor.

2. Report

Consideration of including Accessory Dwelling Units, multi-family units, setbacks, permitting, and residential densities in Growth Management Plan.

The Committee directed Planning staff to provide information regarding Impervious Surface limitation in areas with poor drainage. This will be reviewed in May.

The Committee directed staff, by a vote of 3 to 1, to provide information and recommendations regarding potential increases in impact fees. This will be reviewed in May and is being reviewed by several other Committees as well.

Several other motions were put forward, and appear under Council New Business.

J. [Police, Legal & Judicial Committee](#)

1. Approval to establish a uniform reappointment policy for Boards and Commissions

Mr. DeMoura stated that there is one action item for consideration. He asked if Council would like for Legal staff to re-craft ordinances that would establish a uniform reappointment policy for Boards and Commissions.

Mayor Page stated that she would and put this in the form of a motion; seconded by Mr. Carrier. All present voted in favor.

K. [Public Services Committee](#)

Committee reviewed the Public Services Department's budget for Fiscal Year 2015-2016. A recommendation was made to forward this budget to full Council for approval.

One item on the Committee agenda was deferred and two topics were discussed per the meeting agenda. The topic that was deferred dealt with single use plastic bags. It was deferred pending action on this topic at the state level.

He stated that they discussed a request by Eastwood Townhomes to receive garbage and trash pickup and after receiving input from staff, it was decided to accomplish this under the same precedence that had been set.

He stated that Wakendaw subdivision asked them to repair a spillway structure within their community. The water from there, once it leaves is the Town's issue, but not the Town's issue about water going in. The Committee unanimously directed staff to proceed with making the repair, but it is below the level to where Council does not need to act. For informational purposes only.

L. [Recreation Committee](#)

Mr. Carrier stated that they did approve a few waivers for the East Cooper Faith Network and Wounded Warrior Organization. He stated that they reviewed the budget and Councilman Haynie moved for staff to revisit impact fees for Recreation and provide a report at the next Committee meeting. He stated that the motion was approved.

The Deputy Director, Steve Gergick provided an excellent report on synthetic turf fields versus grass. He detailed the pros and cons for both as to initial cost, maintenance, replacement and usage. Public

Services Director, Jody Peele assisted in the presentation. Councilman Haynie moved for staff to put together a recommendation for a turf field for the football field at Park West. The motion was approved.

He stated that the Mia Hamm camp this past Saturday and Sunday was terrific. He said they have 175 participants and at least that many parents.

M. Transportation

1. Approval to proceed with phased approach to the Coleman Drainage and Revitalization Project

Mayor Page stated that there is one action item and she would like to defer this. She said that Mr. Gawrych is not present and he is a pivotal member of the Transportation Committee.

Mayor Page made a motion to defer the approval to proceed with the phased approach to Coleman drainage and revitalization; seconded by Mr. Smith.

Mr. Haynie asked if this would be deferred until the next Council meeting.

Ms. Page responded in the affirmative. She stated that Mr. Morrison has a presentation which we will hold until the next Council meeting.

All present voted in favor to defer.

**N. Waterworks Commission
Report**

O. Water Supply Committee

Mr. Smith stated that the Commissioners did discuss the funding availability and considerations for Snowden Phase II Wastewater Project. He said more details will be forthcoming.

X. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Boards and Commissions Vacancies:

Planning Commission – 1 Seat

Board of Zoning Appeals – 1 Seat

XI. COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. New Business

1. **Adoption:** A Resolution to establish a Community Investment Policy for the Town of Mount Pleasant. (R.16041)

Mr. Smith moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Owens. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read the *RESOLUTION BY TITLE ONLY. This Resolution SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

2. **Adoption:** A Resolution to establish an Internal Services Fund for the purpose of accounting for health benefits activities for the Town of Mount Pleasant. (R.16042)

Mr. Smith moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Carrier. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read the *RESOLUTION BY TITLE ONLY. This Resolution SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

3. **Adoption:** A Resolution to establish a Debt Service Fund for the purpose of accounting for the borrowing activities for the Town of Mount Pleasant. (R.16043)

Mr. Carrier moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Brimmer. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read the *RESOLUTION BY TITLE ONLY. This Resolution SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

4. **Adoption:** A Resolution to establish a Budget Policy for the Town of Mount Pleasant. (R.16044)

Mr. Carrier moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Brimmer. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read the *RESOLUTION BY TITLE ONLY. This Resolution SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

5. **Adoption:** A Resolution amending the Town of Mount Pleasant Human Resource Guidelines. (R.16045)

Mr. Owens moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Smith. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read the *RESOLUTION BY TITLE ONLY. This Resolution SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

6. **First Reading:** An Ordinance to *approve of a Lease Agreement with Trident Technical College*, relative to the property located at 1004 Hungryneck Boulevard. (Ord. 16033)

Mr. Carrier moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Brimmer. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read *FIRST READING BY TITLE ONLY.*

7. **First Reading:** An Ordinance to adopt and appropriate a Budget for the Town of Mount Pleasant for Fiscal Year 2017 (July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017). (Ord. No. 16034)

Mr. Carrier moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Owens. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read *FIRST READING BY TITLE ONLY.*

8. Discussion and approval to create a Shem Creek taskforce

Mr. Owens stated that he would like to propose a Shem Creek Task Force to represent all of what is good in Mount Pleasant and what is good on Shem Creek. He said that it would give the Town the opportunity to support the working functions of the creek. He stated that it will include property owners, neighbors, and local businesses and incorporate a host of individuals who will be appointed by this Council. He stated that it is important that each member have an opportunity to appoint someone to this task force. He said that there can be a very diverse group of people that will ensure that working waterfront of Shem Creek is maintained and that we can bring forth development that is conducive with the character of Town that we serve and Shem Creek in particular. He said that there are a number of items that will be addressed, one of which is public access for paddle boarders and kayakers. He said the Town is struggling with having public access which is some of the items the task force can address and bring forth solutions. He said that Shem Creek is important to the Town and the #1 photographed area in South Carolina and likely the southeast; it is the heart and soul of the residents of Mount Pleasant. He said this gives Council an opportunity to reach across the lines and bring people together.

Mr. Owens stated that he would like to put this in the form of a motion and asks that Council give careful consideration to approve this unanimously; seconded by Mr. Bustos.

Mayor Page stated that since it is the duty of the Mayor to appoint Committees, she has provided Council with a copy of the guidelines as presented. She asked that Council review the guidelines and make recommendations for any changes or additions they would like to make to the guidelines and will take Council's consideration of appointments. She asked if Council members would provide this information to her within the next week or so, she will review and make the presentation by next month.

Mr. Carrier asked what staff or department will staff this Committee.

Mayor Page stated that she was very concerned, as staff is very busy with the budget. She said that she has not identified staff. She has discussed with the Recreation Department that this may go under the Recreation Committee. She said it may be Government Outreach. She mentioned that she is reluctant to suggest Planning, although there are Planning considerations. She asked Council members to provide her with a timeline when submitting any changes, modifications and appointment recommendations. She does not believe this is the duty of government, but should shift to an outside board with government facilitating the process.

Mr. Smith said for clarification, Council will need to review and make recommendations to the guidelines as submitted, select an appointment for consideration and a timeline.

Mr. Owens stated that he did address staff and the only role that will be required of staff is to have a facilitator. He is in hopes

that staff is amenable to this, but will make recommendations for the Mayor's consideration.

Mayor said that she takes this very seriously and any task force that she would present to Council would have full staff support. She said that it is important to have an end, a report and a recommendation in mind. She said this Town has the best staff in the state.

Mr. Haynie asked for clarification on the motion and second and what Council will actually be voting on this evening.

Mayor Page stated that the vote is to have the Mayor create a Shem Creek Task Force as presented by Mr. Owens.

Mr. Haynie stated that his vision for this was it would be more like a Commission, such as the Old Village Historic Commission where Council appoints the members with nominations a people applying. He said that if it is a task force where one person appoints all members, it will have a very short life and will not have much input.

Mayor Page stated that this is not how it was presented to her and suggested that Mr. Haynie make his recommendations to turn this into a Committee or Commission that is a Standing Committee or Commission, then this would be a recommendation that she will consider.

All present voted in favor.

9. Consideration of Nomination for the Order of the Gavel

Mayor Page stated that this was requested by Mr. Santos for Monsignor James Carter for fifty years of services. She said that the church is having an event at the end of the month. She said

that typically Council would vote to give the highest Town honor to the Monsignor and then the following month, would present the Order of the Gavel in Council Chambers to the Monsignor. Due to the fact that he is recovering from some health issues and is having an event at the end of the month, she is going to ask Council to vote for approval and then ensure the wording gets presented to the Clerk of Council's office so that she can have the award prepared and in time or the Mayor Pro Tem anyone else who would like to participate in his celebration, to present this to him at his own Jubilee.

Mayor Page made this in the form of a motion; seconded by Mr. Owens. All present voted in favor.

B. Old Business

Final Reading: An Ordinance to purchase real property and to sell excess right-of-way and other real property in an exchange among the Town of Mount Pleasant, NationalMax Properties, LLC and Willie McElveen. (Ord. No. 16029)

Mr. Smith moved for approval; seconded by Mr. Owens. All present voted in favor.

Mr. DeMoura read *FINAL READING BY TITLE ONLY*. This Ordinance *SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED* this date.

XII. ADJOURN

There being no further business to discuss, meeting adjourned at 10:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Ashe
April 25, 2016