

**TOWN OF MOUNT PLEASANT, SOUTH CAROLINA
SPECIAL PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
April 8, 2019
MINUTES**

Municipal Complex, Committee Meeting Room

[PowerPoint Presentation](#)

Present: Joe Bustos, Chair, Bob Brimmer, Guang Ming Whitley.
Absent: Tom O'Rourke.
Staff: Eric DeMoura, David Pagliarini, Jeff Ulma, Brad Morrison,
Michele Canon, Liz Boyles

Mr. Bustos called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

1. Public Comments

Ms. Wendy Bowerschmitz, 1320 Woodlake Court, suggested that a workforce housing component should be included with hotel uses. She stated that the average rent is \$1,500 a month and as a result many hotel workers cannot afford to live in Mount Pleasant. She suggested that inclusionary zoning would be one way of accomplishing this, but it is currently at the state legislature for consideration. She suggested that if required, it would be a means of having the workforce live and work in Mount Pleasant as well as reduce the amount of traffic. She stated that this requirement has been done in other areas across the country.

Mr. James Wilson, attorney for Ferry Wharf, LLC, stated that the request for additional residential units have been withdrawn. He also stated that they would like to defer the bus pullout until the area adjacent to this development is completed since there is currently one across the street from this development and one near Waterfront Park.

Mr. Mike Bennett, developer for Ferry Wharf, clarified that the initial request for additional residential units would have reduced the number of hotel rooms and commercial use that would be available.

Mr. Charlie Carmody, 107 New Street, suggested that the height on the former Miller Cadillac site should not be amended. He stated that he is working with the family to sell and develop the site.

2. **Review of Planning Commission recommendations from the [March 20, 2019 meeting](#) and any associated annexations**
 - a. **[R-05-19, Request to amend the Bridgeside II PD](#), Planned Development District Ordinance (Ordinance No. 12034, as amended), to do the following: (i) allow for the conversion of amounts of office and commercial square footage, residential units, and hotel rooms, and increase the maximum allowable amount of residential units from 73 to 150; (ii) to combine the Waterfront District and the Boulevard District into a single district for all purposes under the Planned Development Guidelines and Ordinance 12034, as amended; and (iii) to specify the timing and requirements for roadway improvements and bus pull-outs along Harry M. Hallman Jr. Boulevard as contemplated under Ordinance No. 12034 in connection with the development of the Waterfront District and Boulevard District, located at Bridgeside II / Harry M. Hallman Jr. Boulevard. Parcel ID: Parcels 1 through 9, Common Area, Bridge Creek Alley, Grafton Street, Rice Quarters Lane, Planters Wharf, and Port City Landing, TMS No.'s 517-00-00-245, -247, -248, -249, -250, -251, -252, -253, -254, -126 and -018; 517-00-00-038.**

Mr. Ulma reviewed the request with the Committee. He stated that the Planning Commission recommended denial of the request with the primary concern being the additional residential units. He stated that the applicant has since amended this portion of the request.

Mr. Bustos asked if the trips would remain the same. Mr. Ulma answered in the affirmative. Mr. Bustos asked if the additional units were withdrawn. Mr. Ulma answered in the affirmative.

Ms. Whitley asked about the bus pullout. Mr. Morrison answered that staff's position on the pullout was that it should be constructed as previously agreed to by the previous owner. He suggested that the pullout is still needed and currently is scheduled to be completed prior to any additional buildings being

constructed. He suggested that if a different trigger is desired, then this should be stipulated.

Mr. Brimmer thanked the applicant for withdrawing the residential component as this was a major concern for him as well. He asked about the traffic trip equivalency. Mr. Morrison answered that staff has worked with the applicant to ensure the information is accurate in the table. He stated that going forward, the table would be updated as areas are developed. Mr. Brimmer asked if there are any other impacts that are associated with the amended request not captured under the original impact assessment. Mr. Ulma answered that traffic was the main impact. He stated that another concern was the amount of open space, which has been addressed. Mr. Brimmer asked what benefit the amendments would mean for the Town. Mr. Bennett answered that the main benefit is that buildings E, F, and G are now proposed to be lower in height. He stated that they are trying to be sensitive to height for the entire site and lowering heights of these buildings when possible to create a more main street feel within the heart of the site.

Mr. Bustos asked if the additional residential units are withdrawn. Mr. Ulma answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Brimmer noted that the building height restrictions is not being changed and although the proposed design shows a lower height for those buildings it could be changed if desired.

Mr. Brimmer moved to recommend to Town Council approval of the request with the withdrawal of the request for the additional 77 residential units and that the bus pullout is constructed as originally approved with the impact assessment. Ms. Whitley seconded the motion.

Mr. Brimmer suggested that it is important to have bus stops completed as soon as possible.

Mr. Bustos called for a vote on the motion. All in favor.

3. Consideration of easements on Mathis Ferry Road for the purpose of underground power lines

Mr. Ulma reviewed the request with the Committee.

Mr. Bustos asked if SCE&G is being bought out. Mr. Ulma answered that according to news reports, it appears that this will be the case.

Ms. Whitley stated that having the power lines underground is a benefit for the Town.

Mr. Bustos asked if there would be impacts to trees. Mr. DeMoura answered that although there may be some impacts to trees, undergrounding the power lines would be a long-term benefit in preserving trees along Mathis Ferry Road.

Ms. Whitley moved to recommend to Town Council approval of the easement requests. Mr. Brimmer seconded the motion. All in favor.

4. Discussion of zoning regulations for telecommunications towers in PI-2 zoning district

Mr. Ulma reviewed the request with the Committee.

Mr. Bustos asked who would approve additional locations. Mr. Ulma answered that staff would review requests under PI-2 zoning with other zonings requiring Special Exception approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals (BOZA).

Ms. Whitley stated that there was concern from the public regarding the location of a monopole in this area and suggested that it should not be amended.

Mr. Bustos asked if the main issue was not wanting the water tank removed. Ms. Whitley answered that the issue was both the water tank being removed and having a monopole installed.

Mr. Bustos stated that a pole is needed for Mount Pleasant Waterworks (MPW) to read their water meters.

Mr. Brimmer stated that he is not quite sure the reason for MPW not wanting to go through BOZA for the special exception.

Mr. Bustos suggested that MPW would like to have confidence that the monopole could be installed and there is the possibility that BOZA could deny the request. He stated that the monopole is necessary to install the antennas to read the water meters.

Mr. Brimmer moved to recommend to Town Council approval of the text amendment. Mr. Bustos seconded the motion. Motion passed on a 2 to 1 vote with Mr. Brimmer and Mr. Bustos in favor; Ms. Whitley opposed.

Mr. Brimmer asked if the conditions would have to be met if a special exception was approved. Mr. Ulma answered that there are some requirements, and BOZA can place additional conditions on the request as deemed appropriate.

5. [Comprehensive Plan and Council review schedule](#)

Mr. Bustos asked when the current plan expires. Ms. Boyles answered that it would be approximately October 2019. She reviewed the draft schedule for the Committee's consideration. She stated that a public hearing would also need to be scheduled, which requires 30 days public notice.

Mr. Bustos asked the consequences if not approved by September or October. Mr. DeMoura answered that Town Council can take as much time as needed to review the plan prior to approval.

Ms. Whitley asked how changes would be accomplished. Ms. Boyles answered that changes can be made going forward. She stated that if desired, a public hearing could be held prior to Town Council review and discussion.

Mr. DeMoura suggested that small workshops would be beneficial as well as having a public hearing at the beginning of the process for Town Council to hear public input.

Mr. Brimmer asked if the workshops would be open to the public. He suggested that they should be open to the public for transparency. He asked how the

workshops would work. Mr. Ulma answered that the workshops were to give Town Council a review of the Comprehensive Plan draft document, the intent, etc.

Mr. Bustos asked if the small workshops would cover the same material with each group. Mr. Ulma answered in the affirmative.

Ms. Whitley suggested that having meetings with all of the Town Council members would be a better option. Mr. Brimmer agreed.

Mr. Brimmer suggested that Town Council should hold a public hearing as soon as possible. Mr. Bustos agreed.

The Committee agreed to schedule public hearing as soon as possible and schedule special Town Council meetings as opposed to smaller group meetings.

6. Continued discussion of hotels and zoning regulations

7. Continued discussion of self-storage facilities and zoning regulations

Mr. Ulma reviewed these issues with the Committee.

Mr. Brimmer asked if the Isle of Palms (IOP) Connector area was considered. Mr. Ulma answered that because more of the current hotels are near Towne Centre. Mr. Brimmer suggested that IOP Connector area should be a consideration as well. Mr. Ulma suggested that this could be considered with the Comprehensive Plan update as well.

Mr. Bustos stated that he would like to prevent commercial areas changing from office uses to hotel uses and suggested that if a change to a hotel use is desired a subsequent approval should be required. Mr. Ulma answered that staff's recommendation is to implement conditions within particular zoning districts for hotel uses. Mr. Bustos suggested that if considering a hotel where office uses were previously proposed or constructed, the developer should be required to come back for approval of the hotel use. Mr. Ulma suggested that this would require a separate zoning district to allow hotels and storage units.

Mr. Brimmer suggested that aesthetics is the main issue for storage units and that they could be addressed through conditional uses without having a separate district.

Ms. Whitley expressed concern with administration of the amendments, particularly with non-conforming uses. She suggested that this might create complexities and suggested that it might be better options to obtain the desired result.

Mr. Bustos suggested that staff bring back options on how this could be accomplished for next month. Mr. Ulma answered that this could be accomplished.

Mr. Brimmer suggested that the hotels should be located near amenities such as entertainment, shopping, restaurants, etc.

8. Continued discussion of building heights in the Johnnie Dodds and Chuck Dawley portions of the Boulevard Overlay District

Ms. Canon reviewed the issue with the Committee.

Mr. Bustos suggested that the height should be tapered as you come off the Ravenel bridge to prevent the higher buildings occurring farther down along Johnnie Dodds Blvd.

Mr. Brimmer suggested that he is currently comfortable with the heights and suggested that this should be further discussed during the Comprehensive Plan process. He stated that suggested that the area near the hospital should be reviewed. He suggested that regulating the number of stories might be worthy of discussion as well so there are more pitched roofs rather than trying fit a taller building with a flat roof, particularly for the Chuck Dawley Blvd area. He suggested that transitioning as you come off I-526 onto Chuck Dawley Blvd should be considered as well.

Ms. Whitley expressed concern with changing heights for those properties relying on the current height and should be a consideration when looking at changes in height in the future.

Ms. Canon stated that vested rights would be a protection for those projects that have already been approved.

Mr. Brimmer clarified that he would like to see more interesting building types that do not have flat roofs and suggested that the flat roofs might be a result of trying to maximize building space within the height restrictions.

Mr. Bustos suggested that these should be addressed through the Comp Plan process.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:25 am.

Submitted by,

L. Lynes

SpPlanComm04082019