

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC  
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC  
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

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

Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC  
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028  


Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

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



DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

75	Pireland	9-4-18	<p>5-28 In an earlier letter, I suggested conditioning the approval of residential infill on making a certain percentage of residential units long-term Lifecycle Housing. If we are going to convert some commercial areas to residential mixed-use, shouldn't we try to "kill two birds with one stone" by also satisfying our need for "affordable" housing? I would like to discuss this possible concept.</p>	<p>Edits made to housing diversity recommendations. Some of this could also be implemented through changes in Town ordinances.</p>
76	Pireland	9-4-18	<p>5-31-34 Hubs – Some of what are referred to throughout the Plan as "hubs" don't fit the following description of a Hub: "[It is] "a concentration of residential, retail, dining and service uses that are available at a neighborhood level and easily walkable from surrounding areas. May be smaller or larger, and have differing design guidelines, based upon the needs, character and requirements of the surrounding area." (page 3-3) "Hubs are commercial and public use destinations where residents can easily have some of their daily needs met, ideally within walking or bicycling distance of where they live. (page 5-31) One purpose is to cut down on car trips by having neighborhood commercial options that are accessible by foot. There are existing hubs around Town, but this draft proposes a number of additional, new Hubs. The proposed Hubs would fit within the boundaries of existing primarily commercial areas. (5- 32)</p> <p>The neighborhood hub concept makes sense and fits the above descriptions. It calls for small commercial businesses within walking distance of those who live in the immediate surrounding neighborhoods, to cut down on car trips. The larger the hub is, though, the less it fits the above descriptions. I think we need to use different terms to differentiate the walkable neighborhood "hubs" concept from the larger congregation of commercial businesses to which the primary or exclusive access is by car. Table 5-1 needs to be modified to address the above issues, and to reduce the recommended densities stated therein (9 units per acre, 16 units per acre) which are too high and run</p>	<p>We will refine the definition on page 3-3 to be consistent with the definition on page 5-31. Emily will look at solutions.</p>

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

			Plan Forum members in addition to, or among, the 10-20 Council-appointed citizens?	
94	Pireland	9-4-18	6-7 We can't identify the goals without a legend explaining the letter codes.	Note added. Letters for goals match the letter at the beginning of the document by the goals.
95	Pireland	9-4-18	6-7Admin Action Point #1: add the same qualifier as in my comments ("to the extent consistent with the Focus and Community Vision set forth in this Plan."	We can discuss in the next group meeting.
96	Pireland	9-4-18	There are several action points for which I would suggest a different priority and or timeframe... I can provide those when we meet. Also, a few action points are problematic (related to my comments earlier)... I don't have adequate time to address those here.	Noted
97	PSullivan	9-4-18	1. introduction, pg 1-4: there seems to be a HUGE jump from our few pages of subcommittee notes to the District Plans for various parts of town.....can you help us understand how this happened?	Discussed in previous meeting on Sept 6 <sup>th</sup> .
98	PSullivan	9-4-18	2. pg. 3-2: where did the "description" text come from - I don't recall discussions that were this intricate	This came from subcommittee discussion and break out work.
99	PSullivan	9-4-18	4. pg 3-13 : Saying that the Town has established a "good foundation for this in a green network....." - my initial reaction is that this is a huge stretch - football stadiums, tennis courts, Park West Rec center, soccer/volleyball courts are not a green network to me 5. pg. 4-6: include what traffic level each of these roads was built for	Comment noted.
100	PSullivan	9-4-18	6. pg 4-7: please explain the difference between "daily work person trips" & " all other person trips	We will add this to the explanation in the paragraph before the table.
101	PSullivan	9-4-18	7. somewhere in the transportation section.....when addressing "traffic impact" for a new development, please find a way to request that "cumulative" traffic be accounted for	Traffic Impact Analyses do consider the cumulative impact of traffic from all sources with the project in question added on top.
102	PSullivan	9-4-18	8. pg. 4-21: several questions too long to put here	Noted.
103	PSullivan	9-4-18	9. pg 4-24 - some issues with noted recommendations	Noted.
104	PSullivan	9-4-18	10. pg 4-26 - lots of folks buy off on the concept of connectivity, but when it comes time to use it in their neck	Comment noted.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

			of the woods, then they're against it - this needs a VERY strong case for our enforcing connectivity	
105	PSullivan	9-4-18	11. pg. 4-28 - what is an "alternative payment method"?	Will clarify.
106	PSullivan	9-4-18	12. pg 5-8 - map totally unreadable, so what's the point here?	Maps will be improved.
107	PSullivan	9-4-18	13. pg. 5-9: what is the Community Rating System"	Defined in Action Item.
108	PSullivan	9-4-18	14. pg 5-13 - what do you mean by #3 recommendation?	Set a good example with public buildings.
109	PSullivan	9-4-18	15. pg 5-14: pls give infill & redevelopment examples that are ready or near ready	Unclear what is being asked.
110	PSullivan	9-4-18	16. pg 5-16: define "park land", "open space", "passive green space" - it seems that they can be inter-mixed here	Defined.
111	PSullivan	9-4-18	17. pg 5-23 etc. - how did you decide what should go in each land use type	Professional standards and planning practice.
112	PSullivan	9-4-18	18. pg 5-33: what are "green infrastructure design principles"? & how did you decide that the edge of a hub should be no higher than 45'	Defined.
113	BKoedding	9-21-18	3-3 Recommendations – 3: The term “Special Area Plan” is referenced throughout the Plan. There does not appear to be a specific definition of this term prior to its use. Recommendation 3, seems to imply that this will be determined, at a later date, “based upon citizen input”.	Defined.
114	BKoedding	9-21-18	3-4 3.3 Housing Diversity and Affordability. The definition of “affordability” is in line with the HUD definition. The side bar stating “decent, quality housing”, is very subjective and should be further defined or “decent & quality” should be eliminated. Can this be quantified?	Edit made.
115	BKoedding	9-21-18	5-3 Land Use & Community Design: There does not appear to be a legend that reflects unincorporated land in the TOMP. Is this restricted, more or less to the Settlement Communities, Boone Hall and Hamlin Farms? I mention this, due to the recent news report regarding the “Peach Orchard Plaza”, which is under Charleston County jurisdiction. Are there similar parcels within the TOMP? Section 3.7 Finance Health/Resilience (page 3-12) refers to “annexation of unincorporated properties” and “donut	Not differentiated because all within planning area. We can add a boundary map for reference.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

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

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC  
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028  
Icons: Home, Tree, Car

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

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



DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC  
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

128	PAscue	9-21-18	<p>Base on the traffic "Mobility Element" segment page 4-6 Based on the current growth and the fact that three (3) other communities isn't being documented (verbally) as part of the Ten Mile Area, it indicates (Community Character-5-65) an impression that growth in this area isn't relevant to what's occurring on the Northern Boundary.</p>	Growth in this area is being considered.
129	PAscue	9-21-18	<p>Hence, based on the Mobility Element page 4-6 from US 17 41 to Fifteen Mile Landing based on the traffic table this area compound annual growth rate 2012-2017 is rated third (3rd) within the graphic ratings As you know I've said in our sub-committee meetings as well as the FULL FORUM a traffic light or a blinker need to be place at Highway 17, Beehive and Tubplo Roads. Since, this is planning for the future of these areas, are ongoing for growth.</p>	As with all intersections in town a signal warrant can be conducted and installed if deemed warranted. This also requires coordination with SCDOT as it is a US Hwy.
130	LGordon	9-21-18	<p><b>1) Community Scale Hubs instead of Large Scale Regional Hubs.</b> (see attached letter, #1a) Existing Community Scale hubs already contain limited large scale commercial (Oakland, Seaside Farms, Six Mile, Wando Crossing, Belle Hall center, etc..) Creating <i>larger concentrations</i> of large scale commercial (via Regional) would create more of the problems we are trying to contain. Again, I think hubs should be limited to Community Scale. Also hotels and tourist traffic do not need to be further distributed throughout the town, but be contained more near Ravenel Bridge.</p>	Discussed at Plan Forum meeting on Sept 6 <sup>th</sup> . This will also be considered in the special area plans.
131	LGordon	9-21-18	<p><b>2) There needs to be a needs assessment re: what, in addition to the Commercial Hubs we <i>already</i> have, is <i>actually needed and where</i>.</b> (See attached, #6) Involving citizens from respective planning areas. What's needed/would be supported? Or not. Our surveys have not really lent themselves to this and think unwise to superimpose system of hubs without better assessment of</p>	Discussed at Plan Forum meeting on Sept 6 <sup>th</sup> . This will also be considered in the special area plans.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

			needs. And then <i>separately considering which</i> of these needed hubs might warrant additional residential. A subcategory, but not automatic. And not to plan additional mixed use hubs near already existing ones.	
132	LGordon	9-21-18	<b>3) Densities proposed for any mixed use hubs need to be much more moderate. (#4)</b> High density/Urban Corridor 16/acre densities are not needed, if any added residential is warranted; and I think unacceptable to residents. In general there seems to be too much focus on adding additional residential when we are trying to limit that. And a 45' height at the <i>edge</i> would be higher than many adjoining neighborhoods and is higher than the current 40' (abutting) limit in Urban Corridor. Even at that, people are looking down into the windows of existing houses. Heights at the edge should probably be contingent/within a limit of what already exists, if they are to truly blend or be context sensitive.	Discussed at Plan Forum meeting on Sept 6th. This will also be considered in the special area plans.
133	LGordon	9-21-18	<b>4) The prominently stated goal and emphasis on "infill".</b> (see attached letter #3)	Comment noted.
134	LGordon	9-21-18	<b>5) Waterways and Gateways need more protection and work</b> if they are to meet the definitions.(see attached, #7,8).	This will be considered in the special area plans
135	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>HOUSING AFFORDABILITY QUESTION</b> - pg. 3-5, how can we ensure through the comp plan that all of our issues are not transferred over to the "Housing for All" new non-profit?	Comment noted.
136	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>2.2 GOALS</b> – have each of these been cross-checked with recommendations further in the plan? Especially 2.2 "A" which was 90%, "E" @94%, "F" @95%, "P" @ 91%, "R" @89%	Yes.
137	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>2-4 SETTLEMENT COMMUNITIES</b> – pg 3-7, need to add 1. coordinating with Gullah Geechee Corridor Commission, 2. Educate local communities on costs, benefits & process of annexation, 3. Help Gullah Geechee community become economically profitable	Edits made.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

138	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>Pg. 3-13</b> – what a good definition of “green network”?	Defined in text.
139	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>Pg. 3-14</b> – why aren’t freshwater & saltwater wetlands considered “open space”?	Edits made.
140	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>4 MOBILITY ELEMENT</b> It’s called the “mobility” element, “mobility plan” etc., yet multiple times throughout this section it is intermixed with “transportation” – doesn’t make sense to have both	Will edit for consistency throughout. Should be mobility element.
141	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>TABLE 4-1 - Traffic Data of Key Roadways</b> – pg.4-6, please state the capacity the road was built for	Roadways have a given capacity based on criteria such as functional classification, number of lanes and the measured level of service. We can provide the basis for these calculations in the plan or appendix.
142	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>TABLE 4-2 Projected Change in Travel Patterns</b> – pg. 4-7 – 1. please explain difference between “Daily Work Person Trips” & “All Other Person Trips” & 2. how they were calculated – why the increase in “trips beginning in Mt. P. and end outside Town from 2015 to 2040?	We’ve added additional clarifying language.
143	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>4.7 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PERFORMANCE</b> Pg. 4-12 – if transportation impact studies were performed for housing developments all along HWY 41, then why do we now have such bad traffic congestion issues & the Town & County want to widen HWY 41?	A primary goal of long range planning is matching the availability of infrastructure with anticipated demand. Traffic Impact Analyses are a tool used to project impacts from a single development. The timing of projects is also dependent on funding availability and prioritization with other needed improvements.
144	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>Table 4-3 Transportation Goals &amp; Performance Measures</b> - Pg. 4-14 - Goal “N” – bikes & peds (sidewalks) should be separated – it’s VERY misleading to combine at bike lanes are few and far between compared to	Comment noted.
145	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 4-20 - #8 – please define “green infrastructure design guidelines”	Defined.
146	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 4-21 – what is the source of this alignment & widening information?	Existing plans, public outreach and staff analysis.
147	PSullivan	9-21-18	Long Pt. Rd. from HWY 17 to Whipple is a “Scenic Highway” which borders on Boone Hall & Snowden neighborhood –	It’s not committed rather a what if scenario to do due diligence in case the property develops.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

			Boone Hall is historic property listed on the National Register of Historic Places – why widen this road to 4 lanes? You’d be destroying historic property & loose all the trees that make it a scenic highway	
148	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 4-23 – Active Traffic Management Strategies – what’s source of these recommendations?...Committee or Staff or both?	Project staff recommendations based on professional practice.
149	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 4-24 – what is the source of LPR widening & frontage road from @ LPR & HWY 17? That is Boone Hall historic property! - What do all the numbers on this map mean?	It’s not committed rather a what if scenario to do due diligence in case the property develops. The numbers are the project IDs from the tables.
150	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>COMMUNITY CHARACTER</b> 3.1 Network plans recommendations, pg 5-4, #6. Why provide cost of services & infrastructure to <u>new growth in UNINCORPORATED COUNTY &amp; ACROSS JURISDICTION BOUNDARIES</u> where the Town is a service provider	Edits made.
151	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg 5-7 – why can non-contiguous properties receive service if the project complies with the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, provided they sign an affidavit that they will annex when contiguous???	Town Council and MPWW policy allows this.
152	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 5-13 – Agriculture & Forest Character – don’t understand “active commercial potential based on production of the land” – these two concepts are not complementary	Noted.
153	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg 5-1 – what’s the difference between “passive green spaces” and “park land”?	Defined.
154	PSullivan	9-21-18	<b>Traditional Residential Neighborhoods Description</b> – pg. 5-16 through 5-22 – some paragraphs are real descriptions while others state that something such as sidewalks SHOULD be provided (pg. 5-18)	Noted.
155	PSullivan	9-21-18	Pg. 5-19 – Figure 5-5 - Oliver Brown Road – where is this?	Phillips Community
			<b>Comments received on 10/16 Draft</b>	
156	BKoedding	10-23-18	General comment: Any reference to the TOMP, as the “Town”, shouldn’t it always be capitalized?	Will verify at final edit
157	BKoedding	10-23-18	1.1	Will verify at final edit

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

			Purpose: “This 2018 Comprehensive Plan (the Plan) . . . “ General comment: All references to “The Plan” in the document, shouldn't “Plan” be capitalized?	
158	BKoedding	10-23-18	1.3 How To Use The Plan: Last paragraph, strike “of” from “. . . and evaluating of projects of all types.” Use The Plan: 1st paragraph, last sentence, doesn't seem to read right. “. . . quality of life or level of services of public services.” Should it read “. . . quality of life or levels of service of public service”?	Edits made
159	BKoedding	10-23-18	1.3 How To Use The Plan: Last paragraph, strike “of” from “. . . and evaluating of projects of all types.”	Noted
160	BKoedding	10-23-18	1.3 How To Use The Plan: Last paragraph, change from “. . . a project on the balance meets the intent . . . “, to read “. . . a project, on balance, meets the intent . . . “	Edits made
161	BKoedding	10-23-18	1.4 Planning Process: Last paragraph. Add comma “This was done verbally, as well as . . . “	Edits made
162	BKoedding	10-23-18	1.4 Planning Process: Last sentence. Enclose Figure 1-2 within the sentence. “. . . to an online survey (Figure 1-2).“	Edits made
163	BKoedding	10-23-18	1.4 Planning Process: Second paragraph, change “them” to read “then”. “These themes were then used as cornerstones . . . “	Edits made
164	BKoedding	10-23-18	1.4 Planning Process: Second paragraph, change to read, “. . . feedback at the January 30, 2018 Open House.”	Edits made
165	BKoedding	10-23-18	2-2 2.2 Goals – Quality of the Built Environment/Place. D) “affordable housing”. I noticed later in the Plan that the definition of “affordable housing” has been removed. Since we use the term “affordable housing”, shouldn't this be properly defined IAW Government/Industry standard?	Edits made
166	BKoedding	10-23-18	Remove “stray” bullet at the top of the page 3-4	Edits made
167	BKoedding	10-23-18	3-6 3.3 Housing Diversity & Affordability: I see where the term “Lifecycle Housing” was introduced. I've checked and there does not appear to be either a Government or Industry definition. I view “Lifecycle Housing”, which allows me to start my life after graduation (H.S./College) and living in the same town, with different types of housing that meets my need's, over time, to transition to retirement	Edits made

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

			housing. Reference: <a href="http://decaturhousing.org/lifecyclehousing.html">http://decaturhousing.org/lifecyclehousing.html</a>	
168	BKoedding	10-23-18	4-9 Safety: Next to last sentence. Enclose Figure 4-4 within the sentence. “. . . involving bicyclists and pedestrians (Figure 4-4).“	Edit Made
169	BKoedding	10-23-18	4-11 Safety: Next to last sentence. Enclose Figure 4-4 within the sentence. “. . . involving bicyclists and pedestrians (Figure 4-4).“	Same comment as above. Edit Made
170	BKoedding	10-23-18	4-17 Table 4-4: Goal R – Port Traffic. The revised Goal seems to be confusing. “If the project supports . . .” Should it read, “Does the project support . . . “	Changed to read: “Does the project...”
171	BKoedding	10-23-18	4-20 Typo: “PLACHOLDER” - missing an “E”. Also, pages 4-28 & 4-30	Replaced by actual maps
172	BKoedding	10-23-18	4-21 4.10 Infrastructure – New Alignments: Last sentence. Enclose Table 4-6 within the sentence. “. . . of mitigating these concerns (Table 4-6).“ Same for Tables 4-7, 4-8 and 4-9 on the following pages.	Edits made
173	BKoedding	10-23-18	4-31 Bullet Leverage technology to enhance mobility. Remove “trains”. Rationale: I can't envision the justification for the expense of light rail in the TOMP, unless this reference is to the North Charleston AMTRAK station.	It's just a general statement of potential transportation modes. This could also include potential connection to a regional light rail or commuter system in Charleston.
174	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-2 Recommendations, 4: Define “by-right” subdivisions. Rationale: First time this phrase is used in the Plan.	Edits made
175	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-4 Recommendations, 2: Is the “capital facilities plan” the same as the “capital improvement plan”? CIP is referenced throughout the Plan. Should both plans be capitalized?	Edits made
176	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-7 Water Utilities – Description: Second paragraph: Make “plant” plural. “. . . provided by four Reverse Osmosis plants with a . . . “	Edits made
177	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-7 Water Utilities – Description: Last paragraph: Spell out acronym “ISO”, since it is its first use in the Plan. “. . . economic development, International Organization for Standardization (ISO) rating and . . . “	Actually not acronym. ISO is the name of the standard. No changes.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Updated 11/16/18

178	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-7 Water Utilities – Description: Last paragraph: Change to read: “One such initiative is the Town's ordinance which . . . “	Edits made
179	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-8 Water Utilities – Description: First paragraph: “. . . septic systems in use this area that could . . . “. Should it be changed to read, “. . . in use in this area . . . “ or “. . . in use in these areas . . . “?	Edits made
180	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-11 Hazard Profile – Description: First paragraph: “. . . and daily commitments by 5 bridges . . . “ Change to read, “. . . and daily commutes by five (5) bridges . . . “	Edits made
181	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-15 Character Areas – Open Spaces: Last sentence: Add comma: “. . . includes Conservation Open Space, Recreation Open Space, and Gateways . . . “	Edits made
182	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-24Applicable Zoning District: Add a space: “Community Conservation (CC) (Inside Urban Growth Boundary)”	Edits made
183	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-36 Regional Scale Commercial – Description: Third bullet: Change to read, “. . . linear parks, and green spaces are . . . “	Edits made
184	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-39 Hubs (Overlay District): Leave “Town” capitalized when used on this page.	Noted
185	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-39 The Three Types of Hubs – Hubs for Preservation: Last paragraph: Change to read, “. . . to protect and not experience significant change.”	Edits made
186	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-40Hubs for Redevelopment/Redesign: Last paragraph: Change to read, “These locations tend to be obsolete and oversized . . . “	Edits made
187	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-40 Proposed Hubs: Last sentence: This sentence is awkward, beginning with “Stripping” and with “nodal thoughtfully-designed”. Its not clear as to what is being conveyed here.	Edits made
188	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-41Proposed Hubs: “Republic Tract”. For clarification, change to read, “. . . the Republic Tract (SC 41 Corridor) and the Carolina . . .” Rational: Many residents may not know the location of this hub. Reference on page 5-49 is more specific to location.	Edits made

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

189	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-47 Table 5-1: State Road S-10-97: Shouldn't this be labeled as "Figure 5-XX: State Road S-10-97? If so, it also changes all of the subsequent Table numbering. For clarification, add "(Longpoint Road)" after "S-10-97"	Edits made (Need to double check formatting at the end)
190	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-49 Waterfront: Second paragraph: Change to read ". . . the Republic Tract on the Wando . . .". Rationale: Consistency. "Tract" is the term previously used versus "Property".	Edits made
191	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-50 Description: First bullet: Change "locals" to read "residents".	Edits made
192	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-51 Description: First Bullet: The term "ferry" should be changed to "water taxi". Rationale: For consistency, and a taxi implies passengers only; commuter and/or tourist.	Edits made
193	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-67 Recommendations: 5: "Create a special area plan for development at Patriot's Point . . ." References to "Patriot's Point" begin at the Waterfront discussion of Section 5, Community Character, of the Plan (page 5-49). A clarification should be added that this waterfront acreage is SC state property and is managed by the Patriot's Point Development Authority and is not incorporated in the Town.	Noted
194	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-67 Recommendations: 5: "Manage the Shem Creek area . . ." Should any reference be made to the "Shem Creek Task Force", which was created by Town Council in April 2016	Edits made
195	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-78 Route 17 North District – Description: First paragraph: Change to read, ". . . from 50-100 years ago, so they provide the best . . ."	Edits made
196	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-82 SC Highway 41 District – Description: Second paragraph: Delete the word "Meanwhile", to read: "However, neighborhood character should be . . ."	Noted
197	BKoedding	10-23-18	5-82 SC Highway 41 District – Description: Last paragraph: The term "ferry" should be changed to "water taxi". Rationale: For consistency, and a taxi implies passenger only, commuter and/or tourist.	Edits made
198	BKoedding	10-23-18	6-1 6.2 Priority Investment: Third paragraph: Include the	Edits made



DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

			abbreviations for Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) and Comprehensive Maintenance Plan (CMP), within the sentence.	
199	BKoedding	10-23-18	6-1 6.2 Priority Investment: Third paragraph: For clarification, change to read: “For the fiscal year 2019 (July through June), versions of these . . . “	Edits made
200	BKoedding	10-23-18	6-2 Time Frame: Ongoing - Second Bullet: Capitalize the word “Plan” x3. For clarity, “ . . . update the implementation matrix and . . . “	Noted
201	BKoedding	10-23-18	6-9 Priority: “High, Medium and Low” are subcategories and should be indented. The same would apply for Time Frame.	Noted - different styles for formatting
202	Pireland	10-15-18	Suggest adding hubs in Table of Contents in section 5.3	Edits made
203	Pireland	10-15-18	Figure 1-1 Can’t decipher map – what are the red squares?	Noted
204	Pireland	10-15-18	Add “Planning Staff’s” creation of the District Plans p 1-5?	Noted
205	Pireland	10-15-18	P3-3 first para:” ...mixed use hubs <u>should be</u> not only shopping...”	Edits made
	Pireland	10-15-18	3-3 last para before bullets “In <u>regional</u> hubs there could be consideration...”	Noted
	Pireland	10-15-18	3-3 third bullet: Recommendations for proposed <u>regional</u> hubs...clarification per discussion 9/6 – m/u only in regional hubs, not in community commercial areas or neighborhood hubs	Noted
	Pireland	10-15-18	3-4 Reference to Appendix – where is appendix?	Data & Resources Section has been added for this draft.
	Pireland	10-15-18	3-4 Rec 4 – would like to clarify that adding mixed use should be only in limited quantities after appropriate impact and needs assessments	Edits made
	Pireland	10-15-18	3-5 Rec 8 – inconsistent with remarks from 9/6 that residential would not be broadly allowed. Propose that any regional hubs where m/u is approved, a certain substantial percentage be required as lifecycle housing.	Edits made
	Pireland	10-15-18	3-6 Rec 2 – too broadly written. Don’t want “middle housing” types springing up all over the place. I understood lifecycle housing discussion to be much more limited – such as making it a condition of adding mixed use in hubs, or for	Noted

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

			redevelopment of multi-family – otherwise, let the 501(c)3 take the lead.	
Pireland	10-15-18		3-7 Scanlonville isn't color coded on figure 3-1	(actually Old Village & Two Mile missing)
Pireland	10-15-18		3-9 What are Pepper Plantation, Tupelo and Bees' Landing? (mentioned by Pearl Ascue) should they also be highlighted/labeled?	Planned developments, no changes
Pireland	10-15-18		3-15 "Fee and rate structures" in first para. Does this language cover possible tax increases? If not, modify language to include that concept – we should hit this head on.	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18		3-16 after recommendations: based on previous illustration – agreement on ensuring fiscal sustainability practices that are "less dependent on real estate generated revenue" yet it seems that a majority of the recommendations are still real-estate-reliant. Maybe also recommend that we undertake review and consideration of ways to amend our tax structure to bridge gaps not attainable without failing to adhere to the community's goals regarding quality of life.	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18		4-5 In figure 4-1 – show Wingo Way as at least a minor arterial.	The functional classification of roads in the town is accomplished following standards provided by FHWA and SCDOT based on certain variables. Wingo Way does not meet the function associated with minor arterials as it does not provide for longer trips in the town associated with arterial roadways. From FHWA: "Minor Arterials provide service for trips of moderate length, serve geographic areas that are smaller than their higher Arterial counterparts and offer connectivity to the higher Arterial system. In an urban context, they interconnect and augment the higher Arterial system, provide intra-community continuity and may carry local bus routes"

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

Pireland	10-15-18	4-11 Has there ever been a traffic impact analysis done of Ben Sawyer and IOP Conn during the summer when school is out of session, for traffic increase going through MP to SI and IOP? If not, why not?	This plan analyzed traffic on an annual average daily basis. This accounts for seasonal variations and peaks.
Pireland	10-15-18	4-15 Projected future traffic/mobility issues can also be addressed, to some degree at least, by slowing population growth, which is not a sign of a failing community, but rather one that is becoming, or has been, built out. ... We talk about slowing growth in a couple of other places in the plan, but shouldn't it be tied here in some way? These 2040 projections feel like they assume a future that is still very much up for discussion. Maybe at least point out that to the extent we can lower some of the projected growth in traffic, we could save substantial sums by eliminating the need for some of these solutions/projects?	The mobility element is developed to be consistent and supportive of the land uses prescribed by this same plan.
Pireland	10-15-18	4-20 @placeholder – will this take into account the developed Patriots Point (Bennett) and the resulting impacts that will have on the arteries serving it? Also – a question – is Bennett committed, through impact fees to pay for the transportation impacts and resulting changes that will be necessary to ameliorate?	All approved and anticipated development in accounted for in the travel demand model. Any development is required to pay impact fees as a part of the development approval process and a portion of those fees does go to assist in funding transportation projects.
Pireland	10-15-18	5-8 Rec 1 – Does this recommendation encompass settlement communities? We have talked about working with the County and MPWW to encourage/fund conversion of those properties to sewer wherever possible.	Yes
Pireland	10-15-18	5-15 five contexts should be five <u>use</u> contexts.	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	5-16 Rec 2 – although you say small scale, I see this concept as potentially becoming over-used and precedential. I think we need to be careful here. Also, should it be limited to lifecycle housing?	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-16 Rec 4 - Consider... <u>Use</u> contexts... context-sensitive...Five <u>Use</u> contexts...	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	5-15 Rec 5 What kind of building do we want to protect? Certainly not all?	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	5-15 Rec 7 – context-sensitive (needs hyphen)	Edits made

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

Pireland	10-15-18	5-18 Para 2 – context-sensitive development...and existing mixed-use hubs... redevelopment and limited, targeted infill...	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	5-19 Para 1... Town codes (as may be revised)	noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-19 bullet 3 – 1-2 stories in height (excluding elevated foundation, in flood-prone areas)	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	5-20 bullet 4 – Pedestrian...improved where possible, including in future (re)development.	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	5-20 Applicable zoning - Suggest changes to conform to plan – eg conventional residential??	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-21 para 1 – Town codes (as may be revised)	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-22 Applicable zoning. Suggest changes to conform to this plan eg traditional residential?	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-24 Mixed neighborhood para – appropriate in these areas, except to the extent limited by neighborhood covenants.	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-27 Applicable zoning – suggest changes to conform to this plan?	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-32 Applicable zoning – suggest changes to conform to this plan?	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-34 re: mixed use in regional comm. This is appropriate for certain select regional hubs, and for the redevelopment of existing mixed use. Big concerns about adding residential within TWO huge regional hubs (Pat Pt & HN) that are virtually next door to each other, especially where located by such challenging intersections & arteries. Also Shem Creek is designated as regional scale waterfront. We should note here that it is an exception to the mixed-use concept, and to see waterfront)	Shem creek is designated as Waterfront, not regional. Otherwise, noted.
Pireland	10-15-18	5-36 Applicable zoning – suggest changes to conform to this plan?	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-39 last redevelopment hub para – who develops each of these special plans? Who will have input?	Town Council appoints
Pireland	10-15-18	5-39 Proposed hubs – this paragraph is redundant	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-40 @end of neigh hub – Watch out – more residential infill???	Land uses are as shown on map

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC  
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

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

Updated 11/16/18

Pireland	10-15-18	5-41 @end of community – re Mixed Resid – redevelopment of existing is fine – existing should be grandfathered, but no new mixed residential.	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-42 re: missing middle – see earlier comments	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-46 rec 4 – re incentives – Be careful – remember what happened with the Boulevard – density bonuses, etc!	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-49 – Pat Pt rec. – add in addition, given the traffic and mobility challenges extant in this area, particular attention to traffic amelioration is warranted to ensure minimum adverse impacts on area residents.	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	5-49 – Shem Ck rec. – add: No residential component here.	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	5-51 Applicable zoning – suggest changes to conform to this plan?	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	5-53 re Buildings – are any buildings, other than historical in nature, appropriate for these areas?	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Section 5-4 For each district map can you add a title?	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	JdDoddsRec 4 see earlier comments & concerns re HN hub.	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	JhDodds Rec 6 – Pay particular attention to the management of traffic along Wingo Way. (Mirrors TC Dist rec #3)	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Do maps stay – if so label.	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Coleman para: OVHD – conforms to the reference in #6 on the next page	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	TC Dist Rec 5 add: ...while protecting the integrity of the Settlement Community that abuts Venning Road.	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	LP Dist rec 3 – <u>an</u> historic district.	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	17Dist rec 1 – The goal <u>is to</u> protect...	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	17Dist rec 2 – relief, <u>ideally without adversely affecting any of the Cultural Core properties.</u>	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	17Dist rec 6 – change to severely restricting or denying except in the rarest of circumstances.	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	41Dist rec 1 – County <u>to</u> ameliorate	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	41Dist rec 3 – as before re: rezonings in settlements – severely restrict or deny	Noted

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

Pireland	10-15-18	CP/10Mile rec 3 – add... home, <u>and should be developed as such.</u>	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	CP/10Mile rec 4 - areas	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	CP/10Mile rec 5 - as before re: rezonings in settlements – severely restrict or deny	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	CP/10Mile rec 6 – add (See Rural District)	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Rural – rec 6 – seems like we need a similar rec for other districts.	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	Short-term efforts – Carefully coordinate ZO amend and Hubs development standards.	Noted. Will be coordinated, but timing of Hubs special area plan may preclude all zoning changes being made simultaneously – may be multiple phases.
Pireland	10-15-18	Mid-term efforts – Actively explore... Consider moving up to short term- ongoing?	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Implementation Committee – membership – how will the members be selected, and by whom? I see this as critical!	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Admin/Org – Offshore drilling – ongoing?	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Reg/G – resid - min 20% of <u>lifecycle housing</u>	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Reg/G – resid – Modify... creation of <u>lifecycle housing...</u>	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Reg/G – resid – unrelated persons... This needs some limits! Neighborhoods will not want college-type housing situations and larger numbers of people sharing a household – this could cause numerous issues.	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Reg/G – resid – tiny house – in certain select areas.	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Reg/G – resid – ADUs – manage them, <u>protecting against abuses and incompatibility with existing neighborhoods,</u> and	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	Reg/G – resid – sp Exc – Way too Broad! This concerns me. No idea what “certain criteria” are or who will draft/decide. Infill could run amok?!	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18	Reg/G – resid – Revise...communities <u>and this plan</u> in terms	Edits made
Pireland	10-15-18	Fin/Cap – <u>Consider possible amendments to the development impact.... And to increase the grace period for redevelopment projects from 2 to 5 years. Consider other ways to provide relief to small locally owned and run</u>	Edits made

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

			businesses seeking to redevelop existing buildings.	
Pireland	10-15-18		Fin/Cap – GMP – to High and Short-Term	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18		Civic E - coordinate with local <u>settlement</u> communities...	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18		Partnership/Coll – 1 <sup>st</sup> – new <u>lifecycle</u> housing	Noted
Pireland	10-15-18		Partnership/Coll – existing housing stock (add ref to lifecycle housing?)	Edits made
KEllis	10-10-18		Consider referencing Charleston Area Justice Ministry’s work toward coming up with a regional Housing Trust Fund.	Edits made
MRobertson (staff)	10-10-18		P 1-2 remove extra “the” before prioritizing	Noted
MRobertson (staff)	10-10-18		P 1-4 “were” instead of “was”, first sentence	Edits made
MCotov	10-10-18		P 6-1 Priority Investment- clarifications of numbers in table-CIP total includes unfunded – clarify beyond 2023 unfunded	Edits made
MCotov	10-10-18		Add Admin division to study of revenue sources.	Edits made
PForum	10-16-18		Include a revamped chart for Hubs	Edits made
PForum	10-16-18		How will we handle accountability for the implementation of the Plan?	Recommending Implementation Committee. Council will set up and oversee.
PForum	10-16-18		Hubs – concern about amount of tall buildings – possibly limiting higher buildings to a % of a given hub?	Within Special Area Plans, because each will be different.
PForum	10-16-18		For Hubs for Redevelopment – should we clarify a preference for “economic development” types of uses – offices preferred?	Edits made
PForum	10-16-18		Scale of Hubs – sizes of hubs and distances between – need to field truth and correct.	Edits made
PForum	10-16-18		Regional hubs should specify hospitals	Edits made
KMitchell (staff)	10-23-18		p. 6-19 multi-use paths in MPW and other rights of way, too.	Edits made
KMitchell (staff)	10-29-18		Add Stormwater Network – address environmental issues w/in recommendations	Noted
KMitchell (staff)	10-29-18		Correct Open Space definition per conversation	Edits made
KMitchell	10-29-18		Misc other comments forthcoming	Noted

**10/16 Plan Forum Comments**

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

PForum	10-16-18	Why was Wingo Way left off?	This area and roadway were included in the analysis. The overriding issue is the location where large amounts of traffic transitions from the local street network on and off the Ravenel Bridge. This area has a proposed interchange project identified in the plan. Additional options include signal timing and other operational adjustments however these types of projects are not typically included in a long range transportation plan as they are considered more as short term operational improvements.
PForum	10-16-18	Addressed SC 41 extension on an older project map. His citizen's group does not want this to happen as it will affect their community. In favor of the Gregorie Ferry project connecting SC 41 to Porcher's Bluff.	Comment noted. While the projects and outcomes are not final, various roadway alignments and alternatives will be considered as improvements advance in the planning process.
PForum	10-16-18	Model indicates 60% Vehicle Hours of Travel	We believe this question was related to the statistic that 60% of the VHT occurs during congested times. This does not mean that the roadways are congested 60% of a 24 hour period but rather that of all the vehicle hours of travel occurring within that 24 hour period, 60% does do under congestion conditions. This makes sense considering the majority of traffic would occur during congested conditions as the large amount of traffic is what causes the congestion.
PSullivan	10-16-18	Commented that the E+C doesn't show much improvement.	Map shown was only E+C and doesn't take into account future projects that are not committed.
PForum	10-16-18	Are there best practices in lowering the delay value? What is a benchmark?	No rules of thumb. We look at the reliability of the system and then consider whether the big picture looks okay.
PForum	10-16-18	What is delay?	If you're driving on US 17 and it's posted at 40 mph, but you're going 25 mph. The difference between the two speeds is the calculated delay.
PForum	10-16-18	Does the E+C map include lanes and lights?	The number of lanes is considered in the model. Signal timing is typically used in microsimulations



DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

				for individual corridors or intersections. It is not included in the town wide analysis.
	PForum	10-16-18	Are they 24 hr periods?	They are average daily
	PForum	10-16-18	If you took Towne Hall and put it on Boone Hall, it would only increase by 2%? Surprised by how marginal of an increase there would be. What are the mobility options for a mixed use area?	It's negligible on an average daily basis- but this a high planning level. The 2-3% is averaged over 24 hours, but peak time would look very different.
	PForum	10-16-18	Does the model reflect the whole planning area?	It accounts for the whole CHATS model.
	PSullivan	10-16-18	Why does SC 41 have patches of severe and moderate throughout?	Modeling uses two layers of data, land use and roadway network. Different land uses connect to the road network, connect to subdivisions, schools, etc. The model reflects exactly what's going on in those areas, but the road as a whole should be looked at and not the individual pieces.
	JHussey	10-16-18	Why are there no connections in the Dunes West area? We need more connections. We are paying the price for saying "I don't want this in my neighborhood"	Comment noted.
	PAscue	10-16-18	Awendaw has large potential for growth, need blinkers in that area for safety.	Comment noted.
	PForum	10-16-18	Won't see drastic changes unless it's a project like a new bypass.	Comment noted
	PForum	10-16-18	Roundabouts are another way of improving traffic, hopefully included in the plan.	There are areas identified specifically for intersection projects, where roundabouts will likely be an improvement to consider.
	PForum	10-16-18	Is the 41 extension the same as widening?	No, the extension is from 17 to Rifle Range Rd and includes intersection improvements.
	PForum	10-16-18	Long Point Rd Realignment and Extension- why is the realignment included?	Council has directed us not to pursue the improvement, but it has been discussed in this process. We need to make assumptions on land use. We must look at it from a long range perspective, we still need to include the project to meet demand of the model. It's purpose is to get to Billy Swails, the purpose of the realignment is to make the connection, if not,

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

				there will be operational issues. We aren't saying it will be considered in 2-4 years, but maybe 20 years. We need to consider it if Boone Hall does consider developing. Instead of widening Long Point, it will funnel traffic to Billy Swails. Concept of alternative parallel network of Billy Swails Blvd. People will seek the path of least resistance.
	PForum	10-16-18	Don't understand the outcry over the realignment.	The realignment would require a small piece of Boone Hall to complete.
	PForum	10-16-18	Why is widening Long Point so expensive?	It's a historical road and also has many environmental impacts to consider.
	PForum	10-16-18	Is there another option for Long Point Road realignment?	Possibly Snee Farm cut through road. Across Christ Church. Portion of farm land to get around church. 17 to Rifle Range connection. None are particularly feasible options.
	PSullivan	10-16-18	Boone Hall and Hamlin Plantations- in one part of the plan, we want to protect the area, but transportation plans recommend it. Do we keep cutting into Boone Hall or Snowden? What's more important to us?	The plan has been updated to clarify that the transportation projects are included to show what projects could serve the area if it were to develop but they are not recommendations of the plan.
	PForum	10-16-18	How much is getting cut into Boone Hall?	The realignment would take a small corner of the property.
	PForum	10-16-18	There needs to be a solution for mitigating event traffic at Boone Hall.	Policy proposed in the plan.
	PForum	10-16-18	SC 41 is not the same as widening. George Freeman disapproves of the SC 41 extension.	Lines in the plan are high-level, as projects move forward, extensive traffic engineering will be done. Including property and community impacts.
	PForum	10-16-18	When we say we're recommending Long Point Rd changes, we wouldn't want to enable further development.	Comment noted. The plan has been updated to clarify that the transportation projects are included to show what projects could serve the area if it were to develop but they are not recommendations of the plan.
	JMcAuley	10-16-18	Could this committee fundamentally say we don't want this	The plan forum's role is absolutely to represent

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

			project in the plan? Is this what the plan forum is about? Is the Plan Forum group able to take a stance?	the community and comment on all aspects of this plan. If a large enough group fundamentally opposes any aspect of the plan it will impact the outcome.
	PForum	10-16-18	Protecting neighborhoods has been a priority throughout this process. A connected neighborhoods theme could come from this plan. Town could buy Boone Hall and use piece to make the roadway projects.	Comment noted.
	PForum	10-16-18	Not in favor of roads that cut through Boone Hall.	Comment noted.
	PForum	10-16-18	We're looking at the next ten years, so why include it?	We don't want to miss out on opportunities. We don't want to miss out ten years down the line when we find we may need those improvements.
	PForum	10-16-18	The issues we're talking about are today's issues. Not future issues.	The plan should consider both.
	PForum	10-16-18	Is the Long Point Rd realignment the key to unlocking the roadway?	We looked at multiple projects. Need to look at multiple facilities. We need to make the connections. Need to have a balance, whether it be timing. Do you want to be in the same seat in 20 years when we're asking why we made those decisions back then? We want you to be aware of the situations. The same discussion was happening years ago about Billy Swails. We look back decisions every 5 years.
	PForum	10-16-18	A lot of these projects won't be seen in his lifetime. But projects need to be done to improve traffic. A small part of the projects are funded. It's a catch 22.	Comment noted. It is almost always the case where needs exceed the resources to meet them.
	PForum	10-16-18	Capacity issues when you take capacity away from other places. Want better traffic, but you can't fix or change anything. Can't have it both ways.	Comment noted.
	PForum	10-16-18	Not going to solve every problem. There will continue to have problems. Hammering on issues that are out of our realm.	Comment noted.
	PForum	10-16-18	A lot of friction, but not at the expense of important areas.	Comment noted.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
Updated 11/16/18

PForum	10-16-18	Decisions made by elected officials are difficult. Folks unhappy about developing Boone Hall need to speak up.	Comment noted.
PForum	10-16-18	We shouldn't present a plan that has a project going through Boone Hall. Work with the owner and county to find a way that could benefit him and town to come up with a solution together. That could be an action point.	The plan has been updated to clarify that the transportation projects are included to show what projects could serve the area if it were to develop but they are not recommendations of the plan.
PForum	10-16-18	More concerned about land use. Chicken or egg issue.	Land Use and Transportation are interrelated leading to the desire to complete these two previously separate plans together.
PForum	10-16-18	Must provide all viable options and have discussion. Important to have options even if you don't like them. Then detail why we don't like the plans.	Comment noted.
PForum	10-16-18	Agrees with Wingo Way. We've learned a lot of information but haven't made huge strides.	Comment noted. As described elsewhere this is a transition area where heavy amounts of traffic enter and exit the Town via the Ravenel Bridge. There are improvements identified in the plan to improve mobility in this area and the interactions between traffic from the bridge transitioning onto the local street network.
PForum	10-16-18	We can't make everyone happy. Important things are cultural. Supports Gregorie Ferry as an idea. Negate immediate push back.	Comment noted.
BKoedding	10-16-18	It's a good plan and it lays out the process. Process is iterative. We're getting way too down into the weeds. We have to be looking into the future. It may not be a viable option, but this is a potential option. We've considered this option. Given this is the lowcountry, we don't have a lot of options. It still goes on even through the approval process. This is not the end. We have a good beginning and checkpoints.	Comment noted.
PForum	10-16-18	Got hit by a truck on his way to work this morning. Attributes to the fact as how hard it is to cross an intersection in this town. We will see large changes in transportation in the future. Automated vehicles. For the	Comment noted and considerations of future technology and policies the town may look at are included in the mobility element.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received through Plan Forum draft reviews and Plan updates in preparation for Planning Commission draft.  
 Updated 11/16/18

			investment made in ..., you can buy 1,000 buses.	
	PForum	10-16-18	Boone Hall and widening- as long as Boone Hall leaves Boone Hall, we should consider changes.	The plan has been updated to clarify that the transportation projects are included to show what projects could serve the area if it were to develop but they are not recommendations of the plan.
	PForum	10-16-18	Saying we can't touch any of Boone Hall is unrealistic and we should consider future changes. Where is the funding coming from?	Funding is detailed in the plan.
	PForum	10-16-18	Encourage and explore outside the box for alternatives. Adaptive traffic lights, adaptive speeds, etc. Look at modern solutions.	Noted and included in some of the potential corridor solutions for US 17.
	PForum	10-16-18	Financial long-term sustainability of the area. We have limited stream impact fees. Lead to higher taxes if you have no more land. Lack of senior and affordable housing. We continue to talk about it but it never gets done. The more the plan forum can interact, the more we can do. It's still staff's plan, not plan forum's plan.	Comment noted.
	PForum	10-16-18	Long Point extension is key piece of transportation grid. Weigh impacts of people who live north of Long Point Rd. New ideas are being derided. We don't want to look at new transportation options or any bold ideas. We want the status quo. We need to be planning for what the future looks like for future generations.	Comment noted.
	PForum	10-16-18	If we have a carbon tax and don't want to pay to use vehicles. Try crossing the crosswalks on the bike. Elevated bike paths, maybe include showers at work. Own traffic network. Automated cars. Don't touch Boone Hall or Philips Community. Settlement communities give us character.	Comment noted.
	PForum	10-16-18	Balance was a central theme this morning. Issue with traffic and Boone Hall. If it was any other property, it would probably be taken already. Is that corner of Boone Hall more important than the traffic that everybody has to deal with on an everyday basis? Can we collectively come up with a better plan?	Comment noted.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



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

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

Updated 11/16/18

Survey	11/5/18	Q1 – Response B - 58%	Edited lifecycle definition p 3-5
Survey	11/5/18	Q2 – Response C - 54%	Added definition of affordable housing p3-5
Survey	11/5/18	Q3 – Response B – 65%	Added definition of workforce housing p3-5
Survey	11/5/18	Q4 – Response B – 52%; Response A 44%	Incorporated into Recommendations p.3-6
Survey	11/5/18	Q5 – Response B – 83%	Incorporated into Recommendations p3-6
Survey	11/5/18	Q6 – Response B – 62%	Incorporated into Recommendations p 3-6
Survey	11/5/18	Q7 – Response C – 72%	Incorporated into Recommendations p 3-6
Survey	11/5/18	Q8 – Response B – 57%	Incorporated into Recommendations p 3-6
Survey	11/5/18	Q9 – Response C – 52%	Incorporated into Recommendations p 3-6
Survey	11/5/18	Q10 – Response B – 60%	Incorporated into General Hub Guidelines p 7-26
Survey	11/5/18	Q11 – Response B – 85%	Incorporated into Hubs (Overlay) Description p 7-22
Survey	11/5/18	Q12 – Response A – 56%	Incorporated into Hubs (Overlay) Description p 7-22
Survey	11/5/18	Q13 – Response B – 56%	Incorporated into General Hub Guidelines p 7-26
Survey	11/5/18	Q14 – Response B – 81%	Incorporated into Hubs (Overlay) Description p 7-22
Survey	11/5/18	Q15 – Response A – 68%	Incorporated into Hubs (Overlay) Description p 7-22
Survey	11/5/18	Q16 – Response B – 72%	Edited Long Point Road Project description
Survey	11/5/18	Q17 – Response B – 59%	Edited Regulatory/Guidelines Action Item p 6-12 & p 6-15; Edited Hub Recommendation 5 p 7-30
Survey	11/5/18	Q18 – Response B – 63%	Edited Programs/Initiatives Action Item p 6-26
Survey	11/5/18	Q19 – Response B – 67%	Edited Regulatory/Guidelines Action Item p 6-12 & Partnership/Collaboration p 6-18
Survey	11/5/18	Q20 – Response B – 78%	Edited Partnership/Collaboration Action Item p 6-18
Survey	11/5/18	Q21 – Response B – 73%	Edited Programs/Initiatives Action Item p 6-26