

Planning Commission March 16, 2022 Meeting Citizen Participation Guide

REZONINGS

- 1. 63 Columbus St (Eastside – Peninsula) TMS # 4590902151, 152, 153 and 168** – approx. 3.04 acres. Request for subject property to be included in the School (S) Overlay Zone. Zoned Diverse-Residential (DR-2F).

Joan Cain, 67 Nassau St, Charleston: As residents of the east side, we oppose putting the park into the overlay district. It was started as a public space in 1769 and should continue as a public space. The school district has refused to guarantee public access and we feel that is unacceptable. The city has failed to assert its ownership interest in the park, which we feel is a mistake. This is a public park and should remain that way.

Christopher DiMattia, 359 Bayview Dr, Mt. Pleasant: Hampstead Mall was built as a public park and i feel the southeast quadrant should be left out of the school overlay district. It should be open and used by the public and at all times of the day and not be used as the schools play field for use by students only. thank you

Aaron Pope, 109 ½ Hanover St, Charleston: 1) I oppose the rezoning of TMS 4590902151 as part of the School District's rezoning request for the school at 63 Columbus. The ownership of this property is not established. As documented in recent news articles (and admitted by both the District and the City), the title to this property is unclear. The information listed in the PC packet listing the District as applicant and owner of all the parcels is misleading and false. I urge the Planning Commission to reject any rezoning of this parcel until a deed or similar proof of ownership is provided. The School District is applying to rezone a property it can not prove that it owns. 2) I oppose the rezoning of TMS 4590902168 as part of the School District's rezoning request for the school at 63 Columbus. The inclusion of this parcel can only encourage the expansion of the District's footprint into a property that is currently undeveloped and in close proximity to the residential units that border it on three sides. Parcels -152 and -153 make up the area that are generally considered to be included as part of the current footprint. These parcels directly border only three residential properties (TMS 4590902149, 4590902154, and 4590902160). Parcel -168 alone borders 7 residential properties despite being less than 1/10 the size of the existing school area. Parcel -168 is approximately 8,500 square feet, the remaining site is approximately 96,000 square feet. Whatever the District's planned expansion is onto parcel -168, it will have a greater impact and be in closer proximity to existing residences. Further, any development of parcel -168 will result in the loss of trees and stormwater capacity. In summary: The application and inclusion of parcel -151 ignores a real and documented question of ownership and it should be denied. The inclusion of parcel -168 should be denied as it will bring the possible footprint of the existing use much nearer to residential properties around the site and open the door for removal of trees in a flood prone area.

Andrew Massey, 700 Daniel Ellis Dr, Charleston: In this request, I desire for the park quadrant be left out of the overlay, guaranteeing the public entire access to the oldest greenspace in Charleston.

Rhett Puder, 68 Cooper St, Charleston: I believe strongly that the currently fenced in green space should be excluded from this application so as to allow the public access to this very important quadrant of Hampstead Mall Park.

Planning Commission March 16, 2022 Meeting Citizen Participation Guide

Beatrice Bernier, 38 Nassau St, Charleston: I oppose the rezoning of TMS 4590902151 also known as Hampstead Mall Southern Quadrant for the following reasons. 1. This parcel is part of a group of 4 parcels that together constitute of Hampstead Mall the oldest park in city of Charleston since the 1770s and was gifted to the city by a previous owner for public use. The Charleston County School District at a public meeting in January 2022 recognized it did not have title to this parcel. The city is not entitled to give this parcel away nor is ccsd entitled to claim as it as does not own it. Both could be liable for taking away a public right to the square and any of its quadrant including this one. 2. Since the 1770s that is over 250 year, this parcel (along with its 3 other companions) has historically functioned as a public green and then public square and been open to the public for assembly as well as recreation except for the last 40 years when school district enclosed it for their own use 24h/7 days all year round . At one point it was was left fully vacant and unused from 2009 when Fraser school closed to until 2017 when early college high school students started to use it. Residents have voiced opposition to the restriction this a a public square that is protected as a public forum under first amendment. CCSD had not shown a willingness to let the public use what is rightfully a public forum and there is no indication that it will change. At one of the public meeting I was told by the "Head of security" for the school district told me that once a fence and locked gate are in he will never go backward. So i oppose any school overlay district that could restrict future public use. the past 40 years cannot erase the over 250 yeas of this parcel as a public square. 3.The overall CCSD project is incompatible with the residential nature of the area as it does not serve the neighborhood and the lager peninsula where it is located. While i do not oppose the Early High College School concept it certainly does not need this quadrant to function as a high school since it will include a gymnasium and other exterior space on other parcels contiguous to the school building. The school will only include 15 students from the entire peninsula out of 387 students. So taking this parcel is depriving the neighborhood of a public resources to give to users who do not live or work in this neighborhood nor on the peninsula. In addition this neighborhood has grown 10% over last 10 years as shown by 2020 census and more housing is in the pipeline. I oppose the inclusion of this parce in the school district zone as it will deprive existing and future residents of a valuable public resource. 4. Including this parcel into the overlay school lot would increase the overall sf and as such risk future school building expansion on parcels which are abutting a dense residential neighborhood. In an earlier version of the design for this quadrant the concept showed a proposed building taking over a third of the quadrant it has since been removed. including this parcel in the overlay school district risk the reduction of available and accessible open space and and possibility of build out for this reason I oppose the inclusion of this parcel in the overlay district. In regard to the overall school lots including the 3 contiguous parcels TMS 4590902152 ,53 and 168 The Early College High School is facing Trident college within 300' feet of the proposed site. The proposed project was originally presented as a shared facility, classes and uses with Trident Campus which should have minimized the size of any new building, traffic, and parking on the neighborhood. yet as the project was presented it looks that very few resources are shared. For instance Trident Palmer campus is widely underused including its parking and this way before Early High School. Many Trident classes will occur in the evening while early high school occur classes are during the day yet early college is proposing a huge parking to replace an existing green space that could be used as a sport field for the school. So as proposed the project is incompatible with neighborhood as it does not take advantage of its shared use concept with Trident. it will increase impervious parking which will have a negative impact on residents with homes (7) directly abutting the school lots but also residents living in the vicinity of the school. so until the school works with trident on a shared parking use system and presents a traffic study as well pedestrian crossing between 2 campus the zoning overall district should be deferred.

English Drews, 1 Wesson Ave, Charleston: I am writing to ask that Hampstead Mall be left out of the overlay district. The Hampstead Mall was built as a public park in 1769, before the American Revolution, and should remain a public park. I am asking asking that the park be omitted from the overlay district and remain public. Public parks build stronger communities and now is the time to be investing in public spaces and opening up the access to them, not restricting access.

Planning Commission March 16, 2022 Meeting Citizen Participation Guide

- 2. 100 Line St (Cannonborough/Elliottborough – Peninsula) TMS # 4600801040** – approx. 0.06 acre. Request rezoning from Diverse-Residential (DR-2F) to Commercial Transitional (CT).

See attached letter.

- 3. 24 N Market St (Downtown – Peninsula) TMS # 4580504023, 031 and 029** – approx. 0.67 acre. Request rezoning from 3 Story and WP Old City Height District to 4 Story Old City Height District. - **DEFERRED**

See attached letter.

PRESERVATION
ESTD SOCIETY 1920
of CHARLESTON

**Position Statement
Planning Commission
March 16, 2022**

100 Line Street

Dear Commission Members:

The Preservation Society of Charleston stands with the Cannonborough-Elliottborough Neighborhood Association in opposition to the proposed rezoning of 100 Line Street from Diverse Residential to Commercial Transitional. In considering the potential effects on the character of the neighborhood, it is important to note that this block of Line Street is zoned DR-2F, ensuring residential use. Meanwhile, a commercial zoning designation would allow for short-term rental use on this property. When the Short-Term Rental Overlay was created in the Cannonborough-Elliottborough neighborhood in 2012, great care was taken to ensure historically residential areas remained predominantly residential. Over the past several years, the short-term rental industry has grown to place incredible pressure on residential housing stock and affordability in this neighborhood, making the preservation of existing residential use even more important.

A balance of uses is essential to the health and livability of this neighborhood, and adding properties to the allowable district for commercial short-term rental use directly threatens that balance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Erin Minnigan
Director of Historic Preservation

PRESERVATION
ESTD SOCIETY 1920
of CHARLESTON

**Position Statement
Planning Commission
March 16, 2022**

24 N Market Street

Dear Commission Members:

The Preservation Society writes in opposition to the request to up-zone 24 North Market Street from a 3 to 4 story height district. We support the integrity of the height districts as drawn, which were designed to be responsive and compatible with the existing context. This particular site is situated within a highly sensitive, historic area, directly adjacent to the City Market and US Custom House, which are both individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. While 4-story height districts exist nearby, we urge the Planning Commission to keep intact the 3/3.5-story district running the length of North Market to minimize impacts of new development on these highly significant historic structures, as well as help preserve viewsheds toward the Cooper River.

Under Sec. 54-306, the Commission is tasked with considering “the context of the property, the character of the immediate area, street widths around the property, and whether the requested rezoning will be compatible with surrounding properties.” We strongly believe the request to rezone from 3 to 4 stories on this site does not meet the intent of the ordinance and would be detrimental to character of the district. Therefore, we urge you to recommend disapproval of this request.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Erin Minnigan
Director of Historic Preservation