

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.  
 Updated 2/15/19

Comment Number	Respondent	Date Received	Comment	Response
1	MPW	12/4/18	Add MPW to discussion with settlement community members regarding the future of those communities (sec 3.4)	Recommend Edits.
2	MPW	12/4/18	Add Settlement Community recommendation #6 to read: “Coordinate with Mount Pleasant Waterworks to eliminate septic tanks and protect the natural environment in MPW’s designated 208 Water Quality Management Plan Service Area.”	A recommendation to similar effect was already added by the Plan Forum. (MPW apparently had older draft)
3	MPW	12/4/18	Make modifications/clarifications to Water & Sewer Network verbiage and recommendations as noted in comment packet – re: aquifer, system specifics, MPW’s Management Plan	Recommend Edits. (Note: Did not add comment re: enforcing tie in ordinance pending discussion of Mr Millet’s comment re: same)
4	MPW	12/4/18	Add to Settlement Community LU description “Traditionally developed on septic systems, public sewer should be extended when feasible to reduce public health and environmental impacts”	Recommend Edits.
5	MPW	12/4/18	6.2 Priority Investment add MPW to the last bullet for Ongoing Priority projects and to the 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet under short term efforts	Recommend Edits.
6	MPW	12/4/18	Action Tables – Misc wording changes/modifications/clarifications	Recommend Most Edits. (Note: Did not add comment re: enforcing tie in ordinance pending discussion of Mr Millet’s comment re: same)
7	L Gordon	1/8/19	Concern: The emphasis on Regional Hubs, which are large concentrated areas of Large Scale Commercial buildings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location Houston Northcutt v. Patriots Point</li> <li>• Insufficient Distance</li> <li>• Physical area of Regional Hubs too large</li> <li>• Clarity in uses for these areas</li> </ul>	On regional hubs, in general, from the Plan: “The buildings in the center of a <i>regional hub</i> are larger than single family architecture but should still exhibit quality materials appropriate for Mount Pleasant’s Lowcountry context. <u>Community and neighborhood scale commercial uses and moderate density housing types are encouraged at the perimeter of regional hubs to improve connectivity and walkability while providing transition from the adjacent single-family homes to the larger structures</u> ”

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 on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.  
Updated 2/15/19

				<p>at the core of a <i>regional hub</i>. However, it is assumed that some uses within a regional hub rely on access by car.</p> <p>Redesign of these areas is encouraged to include an interconnected gridded street network, and blocks to improve the walkability and reduce conflicts between adjacent uses and promote the integration of community scale features within a larger more auto oriented regional destination so that where these hubs occur there are improved features for the adjacent communities within the area.” (p. A-26)</p> <p>Specific to Patriots Point v. Houston Northcutt Hubs. They are certainly close in proximity but have very different focus/feel/purpose. The Patriots Point Hub is also a Waterfront Hub (p A-27) with a decidedly tourism focus (also A-34). The expectation is that the Houston Northcutt Hub would be more focused on uses for the community that lives here – though that would be decided for certain in the context of a Special Area Plan.</p>
8	L Gordon	1/8/19	Concern: The proposed extensive expansion of Mixed-Use & Multi Family residential, by including it automatically in all of the nodes, regardless of size.	At present, mixed use is allowable throughout the entire Boulevards Overlay District, and high density residential throughout the Houston Northcutt “Hub” area. In Hubs, Multi-family is proposed to be limited to a % of the overall hub area in the proposed plan. Mixed Use units must be able to meet all applicable site/height criteria, including parking.
9	L Gordon	1/8/19	Concern: The prominently stated goal/emphasis on “infill”.	The Plan addresses the complexities of infill development, not so much as a stated goal, but as a reality, given the largely developed nature of the Mount Pleasant area. To ignore the likelihood of future infill development would be irresponsible. By addressing issues related to infill development, we can be proactive (through ordinance amendments and

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 on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.

Updated 2/15/19

				additional planning) in guiding the style and specifics of that development.
10	L Gordon	1/8/19	Concern: the densities that were recommended for the different types of hubs seemed too high.	Specific densities were removed prior to the last version of the Plan in response to these concerns, as well as to be consistent with methodology throughout. Single Family or multifamily units would be limited to a % of the Hub area. Any mixed use must meet all applicable site design criteria and conform to height limitations.
11	L Gordon	1/8/19	Concern: Mixed Use hubs do not need to be added where they already exist or where there are already sufficient commercial and residential resources.	The purpose of designating hubs is to establish criteria to be in place prior to any potential redevelopment of these areas, to ensure that the redevelopment is done in such a way so as to create community spaces meeting the goals of the Plan. The opportunity for a residential component addresses several goals – primarily to provide housing opportunities meeting the “attainable” goal established by the Plan Forum. This will also supplement the customer/employee base for the retail/office establishments, and boost opportunities for transit ridership.
12	L Gordon	1/8/19	Concern: Needs Assessment done prior to proposing placement of additional hubs.	Again – Hubs were identified in areas with potential for redevelopment, to provide opportunities to conduct detailed studies of these areas (Special Area Plans) that will inform the creation of zoning for these areas to meet the goals of the Plan.
13	L Gordon	1/8/19	Concern: Tourist focus of Waterfront Areas.	Guidelines for each of the Waterfront areas are spelled out in the Waterfront Land Use section (p. A-34). Clearly there are differences between Patriots Point and Shem Creek, but there are also similarities, especially in trying to reach the citizens’ wishes for public access

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.  
 Updated 2/15/19

				to the waterfront. For better or for worse, the amenities that local residents like (waterfront views and access) are also appreciated and enjoyed by tourists.
14	L Gordon	1/8/19	Concern: Gateways need more work.	To be accomplished with ordinance revisions in context of review of existing plans/ordinances. (Action Items p. 6-14 & 15; Gateways & Corridors p A-43)
15	L Gordon	1/8/19	Concern: changes in classification of single-family neighborhoods. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use classifications</li> <li>• Redefining definition of how many unrelated people can live in a single house</li> </ul>	Land Use classifications were redefined but were applied to neighborhoods based upon the zoning of the parcels there. Definition of Single Family recommended for revision to be tied to number of bedrooms. Big House multi-family recommended for consideration in areas of new development.
16	P Ireland	1/8/19	Concern: Regional Hub Concept <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of buildings</li> <li>• Distance apart</li> <li>• Houston Northcutt Hub</li> <li>• Gateway</li> <li>• Focus on Special Area Plans</li> </ul>	Agree that the language on p A-26 should be clarified. The intent was never that ALL buildings should be 100,000 sf, but that some might reach that size. As stated throughout, different areas of Town have different characters & needs. THIS is the reason for the recommendation for Special Area Plans. These plans need to focus in on the specifics of each area, to a level of detail that is outside the scope of this town-wide Comprehensive Plan. If all the areas were the same and to be treated the same, it might be different. The complexities, however, of determining the needs/character for each specific area (5 areas for redevelopment, alone), and then writing ordinances to enforce those must be handled separately to ensure an appropriate level of detail and area input.
17	P Ireland	1/8/19	Concern: Real Estate-Dependent Revenue Stream <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More focus on non-real estate driven revenues</li> </ul>	The survey referenced was mis-quoted. It referenced “real-estate <u>development</u>

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.  
 Updated 2/15/19

				generated revenue”. (Noun is development, nor real estate.) The town’s authorized sources of revenue are largely based upon the uses of land within the Town, and so will always be tied to local “real-estate”. The Plan’s recommendations address using the Town’s local resources (including developed land) wisely so that the land generates revenues in an efficient manner. The focus is not on “real-estate development”, per se, but on wise use of the real-estate in the Town, to balance the revenues received with the costs of providing services, so that we’re self-sustaining, not dependent on future growth.
18	P Ireland	1/8/19	Concern: Zoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevent prevalence of uses that add little to no value– esp. storage facilities &amp; hotels</li> </ul>	Could consider zoning changes (make special exceptions?), but currently have no mechanism to address “too many” of a particular type of business – market decision.
19	P Ireland	1/8/19	Concern: Wingo Way	<p>The functional classification of roadways is a process of categorizing roadways according to the function that they serve within the overall roadway network. Functional Classification guidance and standardized definitions are provided by the Federal Highway Administration and South Carolina DOT. Wingo Way is included in the plan and classified as a local roadway in that it’s primary purpose is to provide shorter trips with connections to other roadways and access to adjacent land through driveways and other connections. The segment of Wingo Way between the Ravenel Bridge and Houston Northcut Boulevard is slightly over a half mile long. In contrast the functional purpose of Arterial roadways is to provide middle to long distance mobility with less access to adjacent land.</p> <p>As mentioned in the comment, a primary cause of congestion occurring on Wingo Way is not the physical limitations of Wingo Way itself but rather it’s close proximity to US 17. Due to this close proximity, motorists use it as a parallel reliver for access to US 17 and the Ravenel Bridge. Congestion occurs near the bridge as high</p>



				<p>volumes of traffic on the limited access bridge converge into the local street network upon arriving in Mount Pleasant. This understanding of larger traffic patterns and roadway network performance was used by the plan development team in developing the project list. While not located directly on Wingo Way the US 17 and Houston Northcut Boulevard Interchange project (Table 4-10, project I1) will directly impact and improve traffic conditions on Wingo Way. This project, combined with intersection improvements further downstream on US 17 at South Shelmore Boulevard (Table 4-10, project I5) and at Anna Knapp Boulevard (Table 4-10, project I8) will improve travel reliability on the US 17 corridor as a whole and lessen the need or benefit of traffic using Wingo Way as an alternative. With respect to Wingo Way itself, the Town is always able to and monitoring the need for smaller operational projects at intersections or locations that may improve safety and the traveling experience. Many of these smaller projects may be completed without rising to the size and scope of a typical project included in a Long Range Transportation Plan.</p> <p>In Summary, during this planning process the travel and roadway network needs in and around Wingo Way were studied with a substantial interchange project proposed in the near vicinity that will provide travel benefits to Wingo Way. In addition the Town will continue to monitor and identify opportunities for smaller improvements in the area that do not rise to the level in size or scope of a Long Range Transportation Plan project.</p>
20	P Ireland	1/8/19	<p>Concern: Lifecycle, Workforce &amp; Missing Middle Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tie any mixed use to “attainable” housing (120% of MSA median income)</li> <li>• Missing Middle housing/ADUs/Single family definition</li> </ul>	<p>Special Area Plans is defined on page 3-5 Attainable and Workforce Housing are defined on page 3-7 Missing Middle Housing is defined on p 3-8 Housing Diversity &amp; Affordability Recommendations address location of lifecycle, workforce &amp; attainable housing (p3-8), but could certainly be amended to clarify/require “workforce housing” (120% of MSA median income)</p>

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 on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.  
Updated 2/15/19

21	P Ireland	1/8/19	<p>Concern: Plan v. Appendices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to search</li> <li>• Mobility</li> </ul>	<p>As discussed at Plan Forum, the intent for the Plan “document” is to eventually be housed on-line, where sections of the Plan that seem to be “stuck at the back” can easily be linked to the appropriate section in the actual text. This is impossible to do with a hard copy. The intent has never been to hide anything – it is just impossible to fit everything onto one page of written text. Would agree that it might be a good idea to continue with chapter numbers, instead of “separating” those later sections into an “appendix”. Again – this was broken out initially because of the limitations of working with large Word documents. Will renumber chapters and pages and verify format when finalizing the document.</p>
22	P Ireland	1/8/19	Land Use details lean toward urbanization	See response to #9
23	G Freeman	1/9 & 1/23/19	Routing/Extension of Hwy 41 to connect to Porcher’s Bluff and Billy Swails	<p>Previous versions of the Town’s Long Range Transportation Plan contemplated a direct connection from US 17/SC 41 to Billy Swails (2002 Plan) and a less direct Gregorie Ferry to Porcher’s Bluff Connection (2006 Plan). Both projects were intended to lessen congestion on US 17 by providing access to the Billy Swails Boulevard parallel facility. With current growth projections and current and future origin-destination patterns (primarily SC 41 traffic to/from US 17 south), the direct connection provides better traffic relief. Additionally, Charleston County is able to perform the alignment study for the extension within the existing federal NEPA process for the SC 41 project. Both connections are recommended to provide better connectivity and travel demand relief.</p>

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.

Updated 2/15/19

24	P Sullivan	1/18/19	Long Point Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening</li> <li>• Frontage Road</li> <li>• Realignment/Connection</li> </ul>	Refer back to Brad’s comments in response via email 1/22. Essentially, widening not recommended in Plan, and other potential projects should consider timing of future (Boone Hall) development plans and Cultural Core Study.
25	C Farrell	1/22/19	Mention Charleston County ED as a partner in the Comp Plan for ED activities.	Edits made - Action Items PC14-16
26	B Wolff	1/21/19	Need condensed version of the Plan	Agree. Wanted to be sure we had the basics right before spent time and effort to condense a draft document
27	B Wolff	1/21/19	Regional Hub at Houston Northcutt	See Comment 7 response
28	B Wolff	1/21/19	Special Area Plans buried on page 222	Special Area Plan is defined & first discussed on page 3-5, related to the process for identifying/defining hubs. The purpose of a SAP is to allow additional refinement and analysis of an area that is more refined than what is possible within a Comprehensive Plan (for instance, the ongoing Shem Creek Area Plan).
29	B Wolff	1/21/19	ADUs – concern with density w/o income source, STR	Action Item page 6-13 to address management and fees for ADUs and STRs. Also anticipated as part of Financial Health /Resilience “Issue” – Recommendation 3 as home-based business opportunities – page 3-18
30	B Wolff	1/21/19	“Is it not possible to calculate and target what a specific “region” needs and go after that type of development, perhaps even to the point of incentivizing it?”	This is the purpose of Special Area Plans. To refine the broad vision of a Comprehensive Plan to a particular area, while focusing in on the specifics that should be adopted in related (zoning) ordinances.
31	C Allen	1/23/19	Scale of hubs v. Pawleys/Beaufort/Hilton Head	Most of our hubs as discussed are very much in line with what is found in these areas. A difference between Mt P and these towns is that none of them are part of a major metropolitan area.

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.  
 Updated 2/15/19

32	C Allen	1/23/19	Community Scale & density of 16 u/a (should be 3,4,6, or rarely 9)	See Comment 10 response
33	B Lavelle-Tullqa	1/23/19	Update 1988 Cultural Resources Survey	Recommend Edits. Add to Action Items
34	J Bagwell	1/23/19	Increase open spaces, increase bike paths; extend multi-family moratorium	Open Spaces and Bike Paths are both supported in the Plan. Multi-family will be a necessary component of any attainable or senior housing plans.
35	ML Moreto	1/23/19	Full-fledged Performing Arts Center; Cultural Master Plan	Planning Commission preference. At present, a cultural/arts center is discussed within the Cultural Core recommendations (p. 3-13) Have added an arts component to CE4.
36	N Wicks	1/23/19	Concerns with potential Republic Tract development – paving paradise	Purpose for Waterfront Hub would be to set out guidelines in advance to allow owner use of their property, while still addressing town/local needs for waterfront access, connectivity and open space.
37	P Mounts	1/23/19	No one will walk to Regional Hub – will drive & create more traffic.	Description of Regional hub includes community and neighborhood scale uses, as well as the opportunity for housing units as a transition to nearby residential areas. Pedestrian and bike linkages would also be built into the design of hubs, to connect to nearby areas. (p A-26)
38	L Evans	1/23/19	Groves “Transition Area” on Frontage Road. Recreation pales in comparison to other areas.	The 4 houses abutting the frontage road in the Groves are shown as Neighborhood Commercial on this Plan (Previous Plan = Transitional). Recommendations in Plan to redefine Neighborhood Commercial to make it truly neighborhood scale. (Action Item RG6, p. 6-12)
39	L Gordon	1/23/19	As above. Opposed to hotels in all hubs	Per draft Plan, typical “chain” hotels would be allowed only in regional hubs. Boutique hotels (<50 units) would be allowed in community hubs. No hotels allowed in neighborhood hubs.
40	B Shimp	1/23/19	Need infrastructure before development	Action Items RG44 and R45 (p. 6-15-16)

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.  
 Updated 2/15/19

41	M Jones	1/23/19	Plan is a compromise. Respect the process.	No changes.
42	J Hussey	1/23/19	Addicted to Growth. Need to diversify the tax base to support Town & infrastructure	No changes.
43	W Hamilton	1/23/19	Need more transit. 8 u/a minimum needed to support transit.	Intent of Hubs is to provide focused areas for transit stops that could include an element of workforce/attainable/senior housing to bolster transit ridership.
44	D Blyth	1/23/19	Need to study the fiscal impact on property owners of the impacts of a more urbanized community.	No changes. By diversifying the tax base, creating additional business opportunities, and using land more efficiently, there will be a more diverse support for the local community, including revenues of the local government. Thus less of a burden on any individual homeowner.
45	R Boyles	1/23/19	Supports Positive Vision for Town	No changes.
46	S Jacobs	1/23/19	Supports hubs. Allow for small convenient developments where seniors can live.	No changes.
47	C Carl	1/23/19	Like to walk/ride bike to local businesses. Need to slow traffic. Need small places nearby everyone can enjoy.	No changes.
48	C York	1/23/19	Concerns about connection of All American Blvd.	All American Boulevard has been in the Long Range Transportation Plan since 2006. When the Laurel Park neighborhood was approved in the 2004/2005 timeframe, the Planning Commission approval required dedication of right-of-way for the current All American Boulevard. An adjacent HOA buffer for the road was included when the neighborhood was platted and a <u>temporary</u> cul-de-sac was constructed <u>within</u> the future ROW to enable turn arounds until the connection was made. This planning was done in order to accommodate known future growth in the north area of Town. Staff anticipates the connection would be almost exclusively used by the Laurel Park residents, as there would be

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.  
 Updated 2/15/19

				no apparent advantage for Ivy Hall residents to use this route. The design of All American Boulevard between this location and George Browder Road to the north was completed in 2011.
49	A Moultrie	1/23/19	Concern about growth and its impacts on the African-American Communities.	Addressed within Settlement Community Issue – page 3-9, among others.
50	P Sullivan	1/23/19	Concerns with Long Point Road discussion in Plan – Need to protect all of Boone Hall & Settlement Communities.	Addressed in Plan as per Plan forum consensus, p 4-31.
51	G Gilmore	1/23/19	Need to ensure we have a sustainable financial plan. Hubs create a financial benefit to the Town.	No changes.
52	D Filan	1/24/19	Trail on powerline easement through Ivy Hall is troubling	Potential part of East Cooper Trail through East Cooper Land Trust.
53	P Ireland	1/24/19	Clarification – concerns with Regional Hub concept – especially Houston Northcutt – 100,000 sq ft minimum	Should clarify language. Not all buildings would be >100,000 sf. Page A-26
54	M Jones	1/28/19	As before – Support Plan as well-considered compromise of town’s citizens.	No changes.
55	E Fludd	1/29/19	Need to include long-time residents in the process.	No changes.
56	R Millet	1/30/19	Need to look at the LOS transportation map with the Hubs shown on it.	Prepared for 2/6 meeting and reviewed at that meeting
57	PI Cmsn	1/30/19	Pedestrian Connectivity very important at Patriot’s Point	Included within Waterfront Land Use and Hub descriptions.
58	PI Cmsn	1/30/19	Are the Attainable Housing numbers legitimate? What sort of wages do they equate to?	Max \$62,625 for an individual; \$89,400 for family of 4, per Wendy at Housing for All
59	D Gregg	1/30/19	Settlement Communities are often an afterthought. How are we treating those that are already in the Town?	No changes.
60	R Millet	1/30/19	Suggest we review the agreement between the Town and MPW with regards to requirement of annexation in order to obtain sewer.	Appropriate for discussion within Special Area Plans for various unincorporated areas
61	G Gates	2/4/19	Want to ensure all Town Departments (especially Police/Fire) have opportunity to comment on Plan.	Have reached out to Department Managers again to request their comments.
62	PI Cmsn	2/6/19	In discussing Financial health, questions arose about Town revenues, sources and splits between different types of land uses. Also about projections that take into account Permit allocation and a slower rate of growth	Have edited to include additional specific financial information received from CFO to answer/address these concerns. Section 3.7

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.  
 Updated 2/15/19

63	J McNeil	2/6/19	Likes the idea of impact fee free zones to encourage development in desired areas.	In Action Items RG5, RG38, RG39
64	D Gregg	2/6/19	Information in Table 4-3 speaks to the need for affordable housing in Mt P – Why would people living in N Chas come to Mt P to work? But we desperately need workers for our various service industries.	Workforce housing initiatives AO6, RG9- RG16
65	G Gates	2/6/19	In Table 4-2 – what is accounted for in “Other factors”? Would this include bicycle/pedestrian involved accidents? Need to know because of safety issues for bike/peds.	Received crash data from consultant and bike/ped crashes. Numbers do not appear to support changes to Table.
66	R Neal	2/6/19	Do we need to include a recommendation for replacing the hung/strung traffic lights with mast arms, like are in some areas?	Per Brad, those are being replaced on a schedule, and as funding and occasion permits.
67	G Gates	2/6/19	Should include recommendation that golf courses undertake the process of being “Audubon certified” to assist with Open Space/greenway goals.	Recommendation to encourage golf courses to participate in the Audubon Cooperative Sanctuary Program for Golf can be included.
68	PIComsn	2/6/19	Agree Community Facilities recommendations 10 & 13 can be combined	Edits made.
69	R Millet	2/6/19	Clarify that the Town should consider creation of a cultural Arts facility in the new Rifle Range Park	Currently, Plan states that the location for a cultural Arts facility should be considered as part of a special area plan for the cultural core area – which includes the Rifle Range Park.
70	PIComsn	2/6/19	What are current water & sewer hook-up fees?	Total fees to hook up to water & sewer in the neighborhood of \$8,900-\$10,900, depending on specific circumstances.
71	PIComsn	2/6/19	Please define “Hazard” in the hazard profile p. 5-11	Edits made.
72	PIComsn	2/6/19	Add in Water Management Network as per Plan Forum recommendation.	Edits made – Network added to section 5.2 Action Items added RG25, PC29, PI11-13.
73	R Millet	2/6/19	Concerns about the height in Mixed Neighborhood Land Use. Should we address further? Perhaps add recommendation to review Building Height Plan as part of the ZO rewrite.	Edits made clarifying that design requirements should be included within the SAP – pages A-28 & A-31
74	J McNeil	2/6/19	Within the Special Area Plans – particularly for the Regional Hubs – height should be addressed by the SAP, as well as transitions, setbacks, design, public space, access, etc	Edits made clarifying that design requirements should be included within the SAP – pages A-28 & A-31

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.

Updated 2/15/19

75	R Millet	2/6/19	In areas beyond the UGB, should look to the County zoning to inform or future zoning of these areas.	Can do in conjunction with future zoning ordinance amendments.
76	J McNeill	2/13/19	Think that it's important to pay attention to both revenues and expenditures in the Plan. Add Consolidated Financial Schedule from Budget p 56 to the Plan.	Edits made
77	R Millet	2/13/19	Break out licenses v permits in table p. 3-17	Edits made
78	R Millet	2/13/19	Future Economic Development strategy should consider needs of the small business community, to help them succeed in Mt Pleasant, to include addressing concerns of high impact fees.	Edits made – recommendation included page 3-19
79	PlCmsn	2/13/19	As they have no effect on the general fund, recommend that the Town consider lowering impact fees in order to spur more commercial development that will bring a better tax base and higher business license fees to the Town.	Edits made – recommendation included page 3-19
80	J McNeill	2/13/19	In the discussion of Hubs, rename the “Regional” hubs to be called “Town” hubs, in recognition of the fact that they are singular destinations in Mt P and serve all residents of the Town. Make changes throughout document/maps.	Edits made
81	K Smith	2/13/19	Waterfront hubs should emphasize resiliency. Prioritize special area plan for the Republic Tract.	Edits made – pages A-27, A-31, A-34
82	J McNeill	2/13/19	Within the Special Area Plans for hubs, be sure to address design requirements for future non-residential development.	Edits made clarifying that design requirements should be included within the SAP – pages A-28 & A-31
83	R Neal	2/13/19	In Table A-1 – Community Hub access & location should be worded to more strongly encourage pedestrian connections and downplay the auto-dependency.	Edits made to Table – page A-30
84	PlCmsn	2/13/19	In Table A-1 –In Typical residential uses – make all development <u>subject to</u> all applicable town standards – not just mixed use.	Edits made to Table – page A-30
85	D Gregg/ R Millet	2/13/19	For the Neighborhood commercial recommendation in front of Snowden, only recommend NC for parcels that are currently used as NC. For any residences, change the recommendation to Settlement community.	Maps being changed
86	PlCmsn	2/13/19	On Hubs map. Remove hubs at community centers in Scanlonville, Greenhill, Miriam Brown center, Ten Mile,	Maps being changed

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC  
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.

Updated 2/15/19

			Jennie Moore, and Waterfront Park as they don't fit with what has come to be defined as hubs. Move the Towne Centre Hub designation onto 17 to incorporate the Indigo Square development as part of that hub. Add 2 new existing neighborhood hubs on 41 – one at entrance to Rivertowne, and one at the Lowe's Food entrance to Dunes West.	
87	D Gregg	2/13/19	On LU maps, find way to designate settlement communities – particularly those in the Town – to help protect their identity.	Working on way to indicate on map.
88	PlCmsn	2/13/19	Old Georgetown "Loop" area should be shown as NC to recognize commercial uses in the area & recommendation of Sweetgrass Basket Overlay.	Maps being changed
89	D Gregg	2/13/19	Eden Rock Hair Salon on Simmons should be NC	Maps being changed
90	J McNeill	2/13/19	On JDB map – post office should be Community Facility – not commercial.	Maps being changed
91	Pl Cmsn	2/13/19	Label on maps should match text – Community Facility, not Public-Institutional.	Maps being changed
92	Staff	2/13/19	Misc. drafting errors on map to be corrected.	Maps being changed
93				
94				
95				
96				
97				
98				
99				
100				
101				
102				
103				
104				
105				
106				
107				
108				

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



*Mount Pleasant SC*  
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.

Updated 2/15/19

109				
110				
111				
112				
113				
114				
115				
116				
117				
118				
119				
120				
121				
122				
123				
124				
125				
126				
127				
128				
129				
130				
131				
132				
133				
134				
135				
136				
137				
138				
139				
140				
141				

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



Mount Pleasant SC  
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.

Updated 2/15/19

142				
143				
144				
145				
146				
147				
148				
149			-	
150				
151				
152				
153				
154				
155				
156				
157				
158				
159				
160				
161				
162				
163				
164				
165				
166				
167				
168				
169				
170				
171				
172				
173				
174				

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – COMMENT TRACKING



*Mount Pleasant SC*  
Comprehensive Plan 2018-2028

Town of Mount Pleasant Comprehensive Plan 2018 – 2020; Comments received on Draft being considered by the Planning Commission.

Updated 2/15/19

175				
176				
177				
178				
179				
180				
181				
182				
183				
184				
185				
186				
187				
188				
189				
190				
191				
192				
193				
194				
195				
196				
197				
198				
199				
200				
201				
202				
203				
204				
205				





