



CITY OF CHARLESTON PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC COMMENT APRIL 6, 2023

A special meeting of the Planning Commission will be held on **Thursday, April 6, 2023** at **5:00 p.m.** in the **Gaillard Center Ballroom** at **2 George Street**.

The following written comments will be provided to the board members 24 hours in advance of the meeting. The comments will also be acknowledged into the record and summarized. The public is encouraged to attend the meeting in person to speak in order for comments to be fully heard.

Application information is available at www.charleston-sc.gov/pc. Please check the website on the meeting date to view any withdrawn or deferred agenda items.

For additional information, please contact:

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, PRESERVATION & SUSTAINABILITY
2 George Street, Suite 3100, Charleston, SC 29401 | 843-724-3781

PLANNING COMMISSION

Union Pier Special Meeting | April 6, 2023

Comments Submitted To Mayor's Office of Innovation Website

First Name	Last Name	Address	Comment	Date
Curt	Shelton	2418 Georgia Guard Dr, Johns Island Sc 29455	Please allow more time so that concerned residents will be able to make their voices heard	Apr 3 2023 3:04PM
ellen	harley	23 Wentworth St. Charleston SC 29401	A thorough Resiliency study must be done by an independent contractor not associated with the developer, the City of Charleston nor the Ports Authority and made public in its entirety. More open, public space should be allotted. Wide sidewalks as all great cities have done rather than giving developers maximum building space. Height limit of 4 stories for any building. Single family homes should be most numerous of building structures to blend with Historic Ansonborough neighborhood.	Apr 3 2023 3:09PM
Brock and Clare	Pernice	4 George Street, Charleston, SC 29401	I wish for the same level of care and taste that contributed to the beauty of the Ion development on Mt. Pleasant. This level of attention to detail could prove the difference between a development that transforms one of the most beautiful and livable cities in the world into an even better one or a development that literally crushes the integrity of what Charleston has been into oblivion. The Preservation Society and Historic Foundation are Godsend. Thank you for everything you do. This is amongst the most important challenge of our times.	Apr 3 2023 3:09PM
Chris	Bonner	31 Moutlrie St	No planning was given over to alternative modes of transportation like bikes, scooters/etc. Dire lanes are quite wide and addition of a 4 lane road through this area is inconsistent with the general width of streets an pedestrian feel in Charleston.	Apr 3 2023 3:11PM
Charles	Drayton	1217 Knightbridge Lane	Union Pier is an important piece of the downtown Charleston landscape; this redevelopment is a significant opportunity for investors and developers to make incredible profits. Please ensure that the citizens of the City and the region are also beneficiaries of this project which is redeveloping something that was owned by all of the citizens of SC. To that end, make sure the infrastructure is supportive of all people and their transportation needs: there should be protected bike lanes, sidewalks that can accommodate a wheel chair and a baby carriage at the same time, a ferry dock is essential for the future of our region (growth has for the most part been horizontal and suburban and sprawling; sea levels are rising; bridges are expensive; water borne transit routes can be altered more easily and more cheaply than roads). Do not give in! Get more for the people of SC, the Charleston area, and the residents of Charleston!	Apr 3 2023 3:32PM

Ashley	Jennings	489 Huger Street, Charleston SC 29403	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reduce the scale of the footprints of buildings and encourage a variation in footprint size. •Create a PUD language that discourages wholesale extrusion of an entire block of building to the maximum height. •Incorporate more green space, at least 25% of building area at interior of development - example: the city needs more fields for rec sports. Expand the waterfront green space. •Create more/larger visual connections to the water through the site. •Carefully consider the relationship of the height of structures to the width of sidewalks and streets (taller buildings should equal wider ROW). •Further define the "plinth", or elevated ground plane, and it's relationship to context - how does it step down at neighboring properties? This is essential to the design. •Include wide bike and pedestrian pathways on all streets (living streets) •Incorporate/require more civic use in the master plan: school/community center/YMCA/etc 	Apr 3 2023 3:32PM
Woody & Peggy	Rash	23 State St	<p>The rendering is far too dense with an inadequate park/public space. There need to be buildings with varying heights to break up the skyline rather than a cluster of 7 story structures. There should a be a mix reflecting Charleston's Historic District of homes and public buildings that do not loom over the site.</p>	Apr 3 2023 3:34PM
Jordan	Amaker	1121 South Blvd, North Charleston, SC 29405	<p>I look forward to seeing proposed improvements made and implemented for complete streets around the Union Pier redevelopment project. As someone who values the many benefits to moving around our peninsula on foot or bike (personal mental/ physical health, health of our environment, wellbeing of entire community, equitable access for those who do not own a vehicle or a require wheelchair for mobility), I am excited at the opportunity this project has to get it right from day 1. Getting it right now means it will save taxpayer dollars down the road when it's realized that changes need to be made. By making it not just accessible, but desirable, for our citizens and visitors to move around outside of single-occupancy vehicles, you reduce congestion, stress, environmental harms. You make navigating this development welcoming and enjoyable for all. There are models and plans that exist to make this happen - it simply requires the commitment and willingness to do so. Please include complete streets in your planning moving forward. I lived on the peninsula for 15+ years and while I currently reside in North Charleston, I work downtown and frequent businesses, libraries and parks on the peninsula every week.</p>	Apr 3 2023 4:10PM

Paul	St. Clair	1935 Culver Ave., Charleston SC 29407	Union Pier should be developed to be an accessible, enjoyable and safe waterfront amenity. The walking and biking infrastructure in the current Union Pier design is inadequate. Charleston is already the most dangerous place to bike or walk in the state. Union Pier should improve on the current state of infrastructure by going above and beyond for walking, biking, and wheelchair access. The funding is available to widen the sidewalks and provide more pedestrian and recreation-oriented amenities. This would allow families to walk together and bikes to actually pass by each other, not to mention wheelchair users, as they enjoy the new development.	Apr 3 2023 4:25PM
Tim	Krupp	Avery Ave, North Charleston, SC	The union pier redevelopment is a fantastic opportunity to make good, quality use of limited waterfront space in the area. However the current planning is completely lacking, short-sided and favors developers over the citizens/city of Charleston. What kind of PUD has no traffic study or minimum parking standard, especially for a downtown area? 1600 housing units and 600 hotel rooms with no minimum parking is asking for problems and a nightmare in the area. How is "around" 50 units of affordable housing adequate for 1600 units proposed? (3%???) I don't understand the lack of planning in these areas. Additionally, the green space should be more fluid, dynamic. Walking, biking and accessibility for all (including handicap) is extremely important. This should tie into bike lanes on the road and into existing and future infrastructure, such as water ferry and BRT. The citizens of Charleston and surrounding areas are TIRED of overbuilt projects with apartments, hotels and such, that prioritize money over functionality and use. Please do not let this be another example of that.	Apr 3 2023 5:09PM
Kelly	Davoren	5 Gadsdenboro St, Charleston 29401	I would like to better understand how the current Union Pier development plan, as submitted by the developer, aligns with the City's vision for itself. Specifically, does the city have its own, public/resident centric, master plan for development/growth that the current Union Pier plan can be compared & contrasted to? If not, our City must undertake this work immediately to both: aide developers in their efforts; and assure regional residents that Charleston will maintain its uniqueness generationally.	Apr 3 2023 5:15PM

Robin	Moulton	34 Society St Unit A Charleston sc 14901	We are the owners of 34 Society St. Unit A. There are many concerns on the topic of Union Pier but my understanding is that the subject of the April 6 presentation is about height, design and density. We are against a plan with many 7+ high flat-roofed buildings. Adding the HVAC on the roofs adds even more height. Many hotels on the peninsula have very successful rooftop bars that now look onto flat unsightly roofs. This will add more. There are already too many in the area. Charleston is losing its quaint "feel" and being boxed in. The original schematics made it look like there would be more green space than the new designs. This is very unfortunate. The residents in the area are extremely concerned how fast all approvals are happening. This complex will change the landscape of the peninsula for generations. It could be positive but not if rushed. Thank you	Apr 3 2023 5:30PM
Emily	Vogelgesang	584 Hainsworth Dr, Charleston, SC 29414	It seems like in this area there should absolutely be a bike lane. Also with the amount of foot traffic expected, can the sidewalks be widened (thinking about the large groups who visit the area and how they take up a lot of sidewalk space). It's so encouraging to see a rain garden included - I hope that native SC plants are being used as part of this and where possible, local businesses being used as the supplier.	Apr 3 2023 5:45PM
Christine	Magnarella Ray	1508 Swamp Fox Ln	The Union Pier Redevelopment Plan is the city's opportunity to create a world-class urban landscape with pedestrian, bicycle, public transportation and automobile infrastructure. The area should have pocket parks, bus shelters, bike share stations and continuous public waterfront access. My understanding is that we the taxpayers will be paying for the infrastructure on this site. It needs to be an area everyone can enjoy.	Apr 3 2023 9:22PM

<p>jean-marie Mauclet</p>	<p>68 Devereaux Avenue Charleston SC 29403</p>	<p>Union Pier Regardless of the way the State Port Authority was offered the Union Pier property free of any reverter clause, the City of Charleston should regard "this once-in-a-century opportunity" as an opportunity for all citizens, a common opportunity, a common. The manner in which commons are treated is a political issue. A people's issue. Since Gwylène Gallimard and I moved to Charleston, in 1984, to open a French Café on Broad street, we have observed how the city, since hurricane Hugo, has succumbed to gentrification and tourism. It is difficult to understand and accept the violence with which underserved local populations are uprooted and sent packing. Without any public transportations to bring them to their workplace, downtown. We are installation artists, who have shown their work throughout America, always to promote social equity and racial justice. In Charleston, among other works, at the City Gallery at Waterfront, in 2018, we presented conNECKted: Imaginings for Truth and Reconciliation. That show only confirmed our dedication to ethical causes. For the last 3 years, exactly since Martha Lou's restaurant closed, shocked as I was to see yet another Charleston landmark fall, I have been building -in my studio- a dream of an equitable Charleston! With partner TINYisPOWERFUL.org, we call it "A TALE OF CHARLESTON". Today, in view of the push by the Port Authority to hand the Union Pier to outsider developers, I am renaming it "A TALE FOR REPARATIONS"... You enter the Tale through the arches of the Bennett Rice Mill. They open on an entirely Green Urban Landscape where habitat is planned around an Education Center [History - Testimonials - Environment], an Urban Farm, a Hydroponics and Fish Farming Complex, combined with an 'Elevated Common' of small-scale eateries, Tiny Businesses and community gathering spaces [Performing Arts - Music - Visual Arts] - [stages - kiosks - forum] ... As for habitat: equitable access to property or rentals, at prices which do not reflect the bloated Charleston market but is based on income! Sorry, I don't really have any leverage on my dreams. If everything may not be for-real in a tale, we know that it always reflects the (un)conscious aspirations of the protagonists, their hopes, their visions. That is why, in my studio and in my dreams, I pay active attention to such fancies and transform them into physical reality. The proposal above is just an artist's transparent screen, on which to apply one's own differences.</p>	<p>Apr 3 2023 9:41PM</p>
---------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------

beatrice	bernier	38 Nassau Street	<p>Please request a model of the site (and maybe 2) being built to show: 1. how the land topography will be modified to accommodate a 9ft elevation throughout the site 2. a second model with new topography and building blocks and heights to show the full development height and parking deck. in addition the program needs to be revised to reduce overall development: 1. reduce hotel rooms by 15% 2. Reduce overall housing units (do we know the price point of all the rental, who can afford to live there year round) but increase affordable housing a minimum of 15% of units for long term residents. 3. Diversify programming to include some ownership for as well office building/work space. 4. increase green space closer to East bay and existing residential neighborhood. and i particular around preserved Mill facade. 5. Address East Bay traffic (a very dangerous corridor for pedestrian) and pedestrian crossings from Ravenel Bridge to the site include traffic study from Morrison Drive to Charlotte and Union Pier site itself. 6 Address removal or modification of rail traffic from site to new State port Authority boundaries. at Charlotte The rail line is one to biggest impediment to view corridor and access to waterfront along Concord Street up to Charlotte Street beyond Union Pier redevelopment itself.</p>	Apr 3 2023 9:52AM
Kevin	Fitzgerald	50 Chapel Street, Charleston	<p>As I've studied the evolving documents and public presentations on the historic opportunity to develop this property, I'm struck by the oft-heard declaration in some quarters that the development process must be "slowed" e.g., to consider opinions, aesthetic preferences, inchoate concerns, on a variety of topics. "Slowing" development of this conspicuously important property, which is its present state is a publicly inaccessible ulcer on the cityscape of more than a century's duration, is not in itself a legitimate objective. Other than as a familiar technique to manufacture "leverage" or an outsized role in decision-making, purposefully causing delay in profoundly needed, long-deferred reclamation projects such as this should be viewed with skepticism and as a significant cost. By way of analogy, championing "delay" of redevelopment of blighted neighborhoods or entire communities devastated by weather catastrophes would be greeted with entirely appropriate dismay and disapproval. There are, to be sure, important matters to study, understand and thoughtfully decide— flood control, traffic effects, finance mechanisms and (within reason) architectural choices among them. The work on those matters has begun and should proceed with all deliberate speed with an objective of thoughtfully accomplishing this project— and reaping its profoundly transformative benefits— sooner not later.</p>	Apr 3 2023 10:11AM

Matt	Gregg	2419 Shiraz Ln	Great to see the waterfront and island parks set aside for public use and what looks to be decent amount of open/green space overall. Given this all all new, would like to see more attention given to how transportation connections for car alternatives are envisioned in the plan. Those are called out as being a point of emphasis on page 14, but there isn't any dedicated bike infrastructure for example or bus/transit network. Having a shared multi-use trail isn't a good solution in this high traffic an area. Bikes and pedestrians should be separated.	Apr 3 2023 10:37PM
Pamela	Eccles	65 Vanderhorst St #E	I feel that the recent unchecked example of mid 20th Century Brutalist Architecture on the peninsula along both the Ashley and Cooper Rivers present a false and ugly impression of Charleston. The cement gray or brick facades are depressing and look cheap. This project needs to be designed and constructed in a manner that compliments our historic downtown. I would love to see historic paint colors used on the exterior of all buildings, especially pastels.	Apr 4 2023 1:56PM
William	Thompson	46 Society Street	Charleston's PUD ordinance requires that a PUD must be "compatible with the density and maximum building height of adjacent developed neighborhoods and the zoning of adjacent undeveloped neighborhoods." Section 54-254e. The Ansonborough historic neighborhood has residential structures no higher than 3 stories. How can the proposed dense clustering of 6 and 7 story structures be reconciled with the City's ordinances?	Apr 4 2023 2:36PM
Michael	Scardato	5 Gadsdenboro St Apt 311, Charleston, SC	While we are told that the density is required to support the payment of the infrastructure needed, presumably tax generated from developed property, what other sources for increased value of property values or restoration of wet lands or flood control or historic preservation are available? For example conservation easements, flood control devices or programs and historic tax credits for the restoration and preservation of the Rice Mill façade. Can any be used to allow density to be reduced and still cover costs of the infrastructure?	Apr 4 2023 3:01PM
Craig	Coit	129 Queen Street	I am concerned about the height of the buildings, the density and the lack of green space. This is a critical undertaking. Charleston cannot create an eyesore and a commercial amusement park like development. It is SO important that we make this a special place for a unique city. Please we cannot fail.	Apr 4 2023 4:25PM

Ms.	Flowers	29403	There is already food insecurity. Adding this amount of occupants in this area is detrimental to the health of Charlestonians. This area cannot handle the amount of traffic. This is an old towne with Historic preservation. We will no longer be able to see the sun. The more buildings that are built, the more crime will increase. Buildings block visibility. Major big cities are a prime example. Let cruise goers taxes continue to fund the port. Greed increases crime.	Apr 4 2023 4:58PM
Heidi	Karlsson	Daniel Island, SC	It is crucial to consider cultural resource preservation when proposing a new urban design, especially in a city like Charleston where the downtown streetscape is characterized by small and mid-sized buildings with complementary fine-grained details. The city's unique cultural heritage and architecture contribute significantly to its identity and charm, and any development must take into account the impact it may have on this historic character. The proposed new urban design that includes block-size buildings lining the streets of Union Pier may be a massive shock to the downtown streetscape. Such a development could potentially damage the city's cultural resources, including historic buildings, sites, and structures, which are invaluable to preserving the city's heritage and identity. Therefore, it is essential to approach the new urban design with sensitivity to the cultural resources and their preservation. One way to achieve this is through a comprehensive cultural resource assessment that can identify the historic buildings, sites, and structures in the area and evaluate their significance. This assessment can guide the design process and ensure that any new development complements the existing streetscape, rather than detracting from it. In conclusion, preserving Charleston's cultural resources is critical to maintaining the city's unique identity and charm. Any proposed new urban design must take into account the impact it may have on the historic streetscape and work to complement and enhance it. A comprehensive cultural resource assessment can guide the design process and ensure that the development respects and preserves the city's heritage. Heidi Karlsson, M.A., CRM Cultural Treasures: Preservation Pathways, LLC M: 214.606.7826 https://preservationpathwaysllc.com	Apr 4 2023 6:32PM
raymond	jenkins	8 oyster row, iop,sc	Has a background check been done on Ken and Robert Dart and Dart Interests? They own Lowe, the developer. There is a total lack of integrity with these individuals.This question needs to be publicly addressed.	Apr 4 2023 7:14AM

Charlotte	Tueckmantel	5 Gadsdenboro Street, #409	Union Pier is a unique opportunity for Charleston to create a downtown area which exemplifies all we are and also is an area of gathering and attraction. To do this the elements must be balanced and not weigh in any one direction (housing, retail, restaurant). The area should preserve what people are attracted to live or visit - strolling streets, colonial architecture, interesting restaurant spaces. Please ensure the plan enhances all that Charleston is and does not create a space which is out of touch with that or looks like any other city.	Apr 4 2023 7:23AM
Leila	Holmes	108 Palm Blvd, IOP SC	I am guessing the residents of downtown Charleston are rueing the day they complained about the Carnival Cruise ships causing traffic and pollution. The planned development of Union Pier with its large number of condos and hotel rooms will bring such congestion to the East Bay Area of downtown it will be a constant battle to get anywhere in the Market area. It was a bit difficult navigating that area once a week when the Sunshine was in port. Imagine the congestion every day all day from the influx of guests and new residents living in the new development. I strongly urge you to reconsider the plan and reduce the number of hotel rooms and condos to at least half of what was presented in the plan.	Apr 4 2023 7:39AM
Bob	Mills	3771 Sawyers Island Dr. Mount Pleasant, SC. 29466	Please don't make this new project an attraction. Charleston has changed its not the casual laidback destination it used to be. Small stores are disappearing due to cost of operations. The skyline has changed for the worse just drive over from Mt. P and see the buildings going up. More people and overcrowding is not the answer or progress.	Apr 4 2023 8:36AM
Alys	Campaigne	1314 Wayne St, Mt Pleasant, SC 29464	I write to urge the Planning Commission to require significant revisions to the proposed plan in order to enhance the amount of upland open space, preserve wetland area for water storage, improve bike access, and retain visual and physical public connectivity to the waterfront. Profit maximization cannot be the driving force in approving the design for such a large, unique, waterfront asset. The Commission has a tremendous opportunity to turn this property into a true model of resilience and beauty for all of us rather than another profit center for developers and the port.	Apr 4 2023 8:48AM

Casey	Nitsch	21 Hester St.	<p>Charleston has a unique opportunity in Union Pier and I am glad for its redevelopment. However, this must take into consideration the impact on the surrounding city and communities, not only today, but in the future. I would encourage the developer to revisit, reconsider, and prioritize the following aspects of the proposed design:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accessibility by wheelchair users and others with mobility and sensory disabilities, which has been described as lacking in the current plan and indeed is lacking throughout much of Charleston due to its historic character. This is an opportunity to ensure we create an accessible space in Charleston, as we are required to do by law and compelled by modern understanding of inclusion that was lacking in the past. Union Pier should strive not only to meet minimum legal requirements regarding accessibility but follow the example of North Charleston and hold itself to a higher standard. 2. Open space and parks. The proposed park space is beautiful but should be maximized. In practice, pocket parks are often poor excuses for parks and not usable for any single identifiable park activity. Please consider the size and location of parks from the user's perspective. 3. Bike access. The current street plan and alternative lack meaningful bike access to the heart of the community, which is needed if the design relies on encouraging bike use and does not provide for parking. 4. Cohesion with surrounding community/skyline. This development should truly seek to be in keeping with the aesthetic of the skyline and surrounding area, one of Charleston's most beautiful features. Similar developments further up the peninsula have relied on the industrial history of the sites to mold modern and industrial features into the buildings, giving them character and maintaining a modest size. Union Pier should seek to do the same. 	<p>Apr 4 2023 8:54AM</p>
-------	--------	---------------	--	----------------------------------

Sally	Davis	61 South Battery Street, Charleston, SC 29401	<p>SLOW DOWN THE PROCESS AND BE MORE CREATIVE! This is a once in a lifetime (or two or three lifetimes) opportunity to create something amazing and memorable for the city, region and state. Let's make it memorable in a good way. There is no need to rush this through by a certain deadline. Please make the priority the wants and needs of the residents of Charleston. It seems that everything that is being developed or improved now is for tourists who are here only for a few days and then leave. We all understand that we need the tourists who support our local businesses but our residents are here every day and every day we deal with increased traffic and congestion. The residents support local businesses as well but are finding it increasingly difficult to support them as we can't make a reservation, get to them or find a place to park! (A priority system for locals should be considered anyway no matter what happens with the pier.) Back to the pier....to put more hotel rooms, shops and other tourist centric opportunities on the pier with only one exit off of the Ravenel Bridge and only one road into the area, the traffic will be unmanageable. It is already reaching that level with the opening of the new buildings along East Bay and Morrison. Be creative....research ways to use the harbor for transportation. Develop 'park and ride' lots in Mount Pleasant, Johns and James Islands with water taxi service to the peninsula. It would certainly cut down on car traffic while creating a new industry for the region and it's a fun way to get to the peninsula. Bus, taxi and pedicabs could have regular connecting routes from the pier. Be thoughtful about the design....there is no need for buildings with heights that will block the views of our historic steeples and buildings from the water. Again...be creative with alternating heights to maximize the appearance from all sides of the property. We do not want solid masses of buildings blocking the views of the city. The bottom line is take your time and be creative. The residents do not want to block the development; we know it's a fait accompli. We just want a thoughtful, creative development that meets our needs and desires as well as those of the developers, the city, the region and the state. I realize that is a very tall order but I think with some "outside of the box" thinking and with some compromise, creativity, and cooperation, it can be done.</p>	Apr 4 2023 8:58AM
-------	-------	---	--	-------------------

Katie	Zimmerman	478 King Street, Suite F	<p>Dear Chairman Karesh and Members of the Planning Commission, Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Union Pier Redevelopment Plan put forth by Lowe Enterprises and the South Carolina State Ports Authority (SPA). We at Charleston Moves reiterate that the redevelopment of Union Pier is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity that will require substantial public support and financing in order to not only serve and connect the community, but to even break ground; therefore:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We expect to see a City-led, public comprehensive planning process to ensure transparency, success, and compliance with the City Plan’s designation of the Union Pier property as a Future Planning Area, "for which there is not a definite land use recommendation in this document, but that would be subject to further public planning activities before any development approvals would occur." 2. Because of the substantial public investment required for this property, the tax increment financing (TIF) district should be hashed out now. Regarding the urban design components of the project specifically, we are tremendously concerned about the ease of use, connectivity, safety, equity and accessibility of the public realm. As renowned walkability proponent and urban designer Jeff Speck reminds us: "As I say in Walkable Cities, cars moving slowly are the lifeblood of the American city ... whether those cars are moving above or below twenty five miles per hour is a fundamental determinant as to whether there are other ways to get around as well, including walking and cycling ... Most of our downtowns have speed limits that are about right, but cars are travelling a full ten to fifteen miles per hour faster. And they’re going that fast because the streets have been engineered to invite speeds faster than the speed limit ... Most traffic engineers practicing today still design streets for higher speeds than they want cars to drive on them, with unsurprisingly deadly outcomes. We can fix this problem by making lanes the right width, by having no more lanes than we need, by making one-way streets two-way again as they once were, by bringing back parallel parking that protects the curb, by adding bike lanes ... Almost every street has an opportunity for better safety, efficiency, and multi-modal transportation ... if you’re interested in equity, cycling is as good a tool as you can employ, because fully 39% of people who cycle to work are from the poorest quartile of income earners ... Acknowledge that streets that have bikes in them are statistically safer for all users. New York City found that with protected bike lanes, serious injury and accidents to all users—not just cyclists but drivers, too—dropped by about two thirds. Everyone is safer in a street that has bikes, because the drivers will be less threatening to the pedestrians as well." In the City of Charleston, and frankly, across the region, the community — elected 	Apr 4 2023 9:06PM
-------	-----------	--------------------------	---	-------------------

officials, municipal planners, citizens, and even state agency officials — lament how difficult and how expensive it is to retrofit projects later in order to realize a long-term vision. Union Pier is an opportunity to essentially build the property from the ground up, with serious foresight. What will the publicly-accessible Union Pier site look like 100 years from now? Who will it serve? And will it align with the recommendations from so many previous planning efforts that the City of Charleston diligently authored? Union Pier's streets and public rights-of-way will ultimately be maintained with taxpayer dollars, and should connect completely, safely and enjoyably with Wonders' Way on the Ravenel Bridge, bike share operations, CARTA routes, and with the forthcoming Ashley River Bridge and Lowcountry Rapid Transit. The future plans for the Lowcountry Lowline and a public ferry system should also not be neglected. It is important to keep in mind that Union Pier is along the East Coast Greenway route, Battery2Beach route, and People Pedal CHS. Designing an entirely new neighborhood on and attached to the peninsula is not simply an exercise on paper — ensuring there is properly designated space for multiple modes of transportation in a real, working City (not a gated community) is vital. Given Lowe's current proposal of extensive hotel rooms on site, there seems to be no deference to the fact that visitors will be driving in a place they are not familiar with, and many hospitality workers will need safe access for their commutes. The current drawings in the PUD's first draft do not consider user conflicts in real life. Union Pier's streetscape must be considered as an addendum to the Citywide Transportation Plan (CTP), approved by City Council in 2018. The Charleston Citywide Transportation Plan will "guide decision making for the future by recommending improvements for all modes of transportation, including walking, cycling, and vehicles. The City seeks to embrace the concept of 'complete streets' by providing strategies and policies to improve mobility and equity. Roadways should become public spaces for multi-modal travel meeting current and future mobility needs." The CTP recognizes that, "In Charleston, discrimination and racialized segregation played a major role in creating significant economic, housing and transportation disparities that still have reverberating affects today. Acknowledging that low income Americans are more likely to use transit, bike and walk in urban areas, it is imperative that the new vision in Charleston does not perpetuate inequities by treating livable communities for these populations as optional or inaccessible. It is important to recognize not only the opportunities to envision a new community building effort for all citizens, but also the need to face the challenges that presently exist for all Charlestonians." Since Union Pier offers a new vision at the ground level, it is a particularly exciting opportunity

to meet a complete streets goal head-on. The CTP references the People Pedal Plan, the Peninsula Mobility Report, and the Upper Peninsula Planning Study, among others. The People Pedal Plan is specifically called out in its phasing: "recommendations outline first improving existing facilities and piggybacking on planned improvements, then establishing a 'Minimum Grid' of corridors essential to mobility for people on bikes, and then filling out the network with long-term improvements." In the Peninsula Mobility Report, recommendations relevant to Union Pier include limiting vehicles downtown, getting to an overarching 15 mph speed limit, the need for developer investment in bike share and bike parking, and finally, "aggressive, safe and separated facilities put in on the major ingress/egress from the Peninsula. Ideally one should be able to commute by bike inter, or intra-Peninsula. It is also a big statement to put in a protected facility on a major thoroughfare for existing and new residents and businesses." The Upper Peninsula Planning Study suggests streetscapes that, for the most part, do not have travel lanes wider than 10.5' and offer a variety of bicycle infrastructure suggestions, including priority at intersections. The CTP also specifically says the following: "Safety is Paramount: A Vision Zero Policy will Require a Different Vision. Charleston had the 11th-highest pedestrian fatalities per 100,000 population in 2016 (Smart Growth America), an ill omen for a place where walking is preferred or a necessity for many people. Few streets have bicycle facilities, but making room in limited rights-of-way will require a very different mindset that deprioritizes vehicular throughput." The Union Pier streetscapes, pathways and other public rights-of-way should utilize the People Pedal Plan as a baseline, and build upon those suggestions to a more robust and connected network. The first draft of the PUD asserts the project team is pursuing: consistency with the City Plan goals and with the City's master roads plan; creating connectivity with the existing network of public streets in adjacent neighborhoods and areas by including provisions for public and private connections; confirming accommodation by existing and planned public facilities including but not limited to, roads, sewer, water, schools, and parks as is evidenced by the coordination letters, newly proposed open space, and traffic study to the extent requested by the City; providing for new public facilities, including open space and recreational amenities, as well as locations for other governmental services; adequately providing for the continued maintenance of common areas, open space, and other public facilities both dedicated and not dedicated to the City by making the latter, non-dedicated areas, space, and facilities an obligation of future property owners; providing for a mix of uses. Development goals include: "Union Pier will improve

mobility on the peninsula. People traveling on foot, bike, public transit, and in automobiles will experience improved streets, intersections, and views to the waterfront, and access to the same." It is not enough to simply state it. The designs must reflect those goals. Unfortunately, the first draft of the PUD does not reflect those goals, nor does it seem to defer to existing City plans. The PUD cites no traffic study conducted, and specifically says that certain uses on the property "shall be excluded from any calculations of new, external trips." The PUD argues the project team should be excluded from certain sidewalk width requirements under the height ordinance. However, the PUD also requests no parking standards, and instead will rely on "an emphasis on the use of bicycles, busing, water ferries and taxis, and other alternatives to the automobile, each of which is anticipated to negatively impact (reduce the need for) traditional use-based minimum parking space requirements." How those alternatives to the automobile will be used safely on site, or connect from off site, is not clear, and is certainly not reflected in the current streetscape proposals. Instead, some of the travel lanes are proposed for 11' wide (wider than City standards); no on-street bicycle infrastructure is proposed; paths are too narrow to accommodate bi-directional travel by people walking, biking and rolling; and several paths and sidewalks fail to even meet minimum width standards. There is no indication that intersections will be designed as narrow as possible with street calming measures or bicycle and pedestrian prioritization. To start addressing these deficiencies, the traffic study should be conducted and include projections for pedestrian and bike usage. From the TRC Manual: "A traffic impact study or other traffic analysis may be required for any project submitted to the Technical Review Committee if determined by Traffic and Transportation that the project impacts vehicular, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, or other mode of transportation in any way ... Document and justify and trip reductions due to other modes (transit, bicycle, pedestrian, etc.)." The TRC Manual also suggests pedestrian counts for areas projected to have high foot traffic. The PUD mentions a ferry system, which the City of Charleston has studied for years. Where is the coordination with the City on that plan and what funding discussions have occurred between the applicant and the City? As stated previously, the redevelopment of Union Pier is an amazing opportunity for both a world-class and equitable extension of the City of Charleston. We expect much more from the street design, pathway design, and connectivity throughout and beyond the site, especially since the public will be footing the bill for years to come. We look forward to the design team's presentation to City Council's Committee on Traffic & Transportation, and

will continue to provide comments throughout the process. Thank you, Katie Zimmerman Charleston Moves Executive Director

Behren	Kittrell	2024 Covey Ln	Please include more green space and bike access! Restrict height to under 4 stories for ANY building and incorporate less impervious surfaces.	Apr 4 2023 9:13AM
Merry	Hofford	2 Laurens St.	Please be sure to note and address the fact that these proposed 6, 7 & 8 story buildings are on top of a 15' raised ground level. So the appearance on the skyline and along the waterfront will be up to 10 stories high; really an obstruction of the lovely city skyline we have today. Thank you.	Apr 4 2023 9:35AM
Richard	Robbins	52 South Battery St.	Subject: Urban Fencing What type of urban fencing will be used to keep the historic area clean and beautiful for the long term construction project. AND, Where will trucks access the construction site? A large project like this could have a huge economic impact on local businesses surrounding the Market and East Bay Streets.	Apr 4 2023 10:14AM

Tommie	Robertson	2 Laurens St, unit 2c, Chas 29401	Understanding that site preparations will be costly and assuming the special tax provision will be used, can't Lowe come up with a definitive number for the least dense, least-tall build-out which will make this project still do-able? This is the approach that should be taken, rather than trying to maximize SPA profits. Show us the financials on what designs can make this project happen without prioritizing SPA profitability and without killing the project.	Apr 4 2023 10:18PM
Eric	Cooper	2403 Mall Dr, Unit 3312	The height of this proposal is fine. In fact, they should be allowed to build taller. The vehicle travel lanes are too wide and should be reduced to promote pedestrians travel and safety. Ultimately having a denser downtown promotes the City's goals to reduce storm water, traffic, and open space impacts while creating needed housing - the number 1 priority.	Apr 4 2023 11:47AM
James	Ewing	75 Ashley Ave.	I am an Ansonborough native whose childhood bedroom overlooked the northern end of Union Pier and across the harbor to the Yorktown. I am eager to see this parcel reunite with the city, with commercial and residential units as well as flood mitigation. One major concern I have is building density and height. We in Charleston have done recent urban infill very well, as witnessed in parcels like Harleston Green, Corinne St, and Brewster Court. These neighborhoods are both dense and completely 'of' Charleston, and some are even built in contemporary architectural idioms. We have also done this poorly, as in the 'donut' style of WestEdge and as repeatedly rejected for 295 Calhoun St. These projects could be Anywhere USA. I strongly encourage the developers to consider a neighborhood that resembles the former more than the latter, and if that means adjusting their purchase price downward to ensure a profit, then they should. After all, SC Ports owns the parcel at zero cost, and the City will get no financial benefit from this resale - and a poorly designed neighborhood would have a negative impact on the city in the long run. In addition, the Union Pier parcel is uniquely sited, covering the waterfront from the Custom House to Laurens St. Many icons of the city skyline are currently visible over the low-slung warehouses at the port today, including the steeples around Marion Square, Grace Church, and taller buildings of the city's central 'spine.' Any development that rises above four or five stories will overwhelm this skyline from the harbor, obscuring a critical aspect of what makes this city such a unique and special place. I urge the utmost caution when considering building heights, preserving the high spine like Boston's Back Bay does with its commercial buildings behind it. I also encourage the breaking up of any masses above three stories so as to preserve numerous sightlines of our iconic steeples, much as London has preserved many river and other iconic viewsheds of St Paul's, despite the encroaching high rises on parts of its perimeter. We	Apr 4 2023 11:56AM

can do this, and do it right, following the examples of these other beautiful historic cities, but in a way that will always be uniquely Charleston. Many thanks for your consideration.

Robert	Kosian	2 Wharfside Street 2B Charleston South Carolina 29401	I would like to compliment the city staff, Lowe and the SCPA on the well thought out plan for Union Pier. The storm surge and flood mitigation components are truly impressive. I urge the City Council and other City departments to move quickly to adopt the submission by the Port Authority.	Apr 5 2023 8:09AM
Anthony	Del Porto	447 Huger St	Density can be good as long as there is adequate connection to public transit services (Lowcountry Rapid Transit), excellent space for walking, bike lanes for biking, "green infrastructure" to help handle our inevitable large rain events, and a focus on public access to the water. Please do not let this become a car-centric design as a car-centric design ensures density mean traffic for everyone around the development.	Apr 5 2023 8:25AM

Zachary	Viscidi	59 Cypress St	<p>Please consider lowering the height of the planned buildings by one to two stories. At recent hearings and within city plans, it was indicated that the highest and most dense development would be occurring at the city spine, along the King and Meeting Street Corridor. This development stands in opposition to that idea. The inclusion of seven story buildings (atop a 15-foot ziggurat) at the exterior of our city would dramatically and permanently alter our beautiful skyline. Currently punctuated by church steeples and a few notable buildings, the proposed development is a marked departure from years of work on cultural preservation and intelligent building. Ending our traditional emphasis on church steeples would be a grave mistake. Tourists and residents desire a unique feel or theme with each locale, and moving away from our uniquely Charleston vibe is a one-time trade off where we gain short-term dollars yet lose long-term cultural identity. In summary, development should be moderately scaled down and fit within this council's previous statements and plans.</p>	Apr 5 2023 8:29AM
lou	valente	843 Center Park St, Daniel Island	<p>I've seen developer presentations where the proposed view shed from various adjacent sites was computer generated to give examples of visual impact. Can this be shown?</p>	Apr 5 2023 8:54AM

Carol	Jackson	1461 Patterson Avenue	<p>Thank you, Chairman and Commissioners for ensuring these "thematic" Union Pier proposed PUD rezoning presentations to the PC are advertised and widely attended/distributed. To cut to the chase for several of the substantive topics expected to be addressed by the Applicants' Team on April 6, I want to be on detailed record in alignment and support of the comments presented by staff reps for Charleston Moves, Coastal Conservation League, Preservation Society and Historic Charleston Foundation. I am greatly encouraged that these longstanding non-profit contributors to the well designed, human scale, livability future of our City are now organized to collaborate in response to the Plan for Union Pier to be as iconic and meritorious as its location and singular chance to "get right" this blank canvas that must stand the test of time for design and daily human scale livability and mobility. Resilient, new urban design is an academic discipline now successfully sponsored within Clemson Graduate Studies right here in Charleston. Their website brags truthfully about the synergistic relationship this program, directed by Dr. B.D. Wortham-Galvin, has had from its beginning with the City of Charleston. More importantly, I am asking the Planning Commissioners to request from the City's Design Center staff their own studied and thorough responses to the "new urban design" elements proposed and/or missing in the Urban Pier PUD submission. I understand that the Design Center is not normally integrally involved in a "regulatory process", but Union Pier as a new urban whole cloth mini-city, is not the normal nor even irregular case. Union Pier is a one-time opportunity to get all aspects of this site right for multi-mobility, people uses and human scale accessibility and enjoyment. Please ask for the City's A game. Thank you.</p>	Apr 5 2023 9:34AM
-------	---------	-----------------------------	--	-------------------------

Andrew	Gould	21 Catfiddle Street	<p>The treatment of the Bennett Rice Mill, as a stabilized ruin, is not the highest and best use for this cultural resource. The main body of this structure should be fully rebuilt. The design is well documented and stood until 1960, when it was ordered demolished by a city that had, at that time, a terrible preservation ethic, and demolished many grand buildings for no other reason than the expense to maintain them. The city should be working to undo that destruction by rebuilding cultural heritage in cases where it can be done accurately and with integrity. The rebuilt rice mill would be an ideal public gathering space for a market-hall or food court type of use. The treatment of damaged buildings as stabilized artifacts is an outdated mid-twentieth-century mode of preservation thinking. In Europe, preservationists no longer treat WWII-era ruins in this way. In examples such as Dresden, and increasing all across Europe, damaged buildings are now fully repaired or replicated and put to public use. Historic structures are artifacts for the contemplation of academics - they are our cultural heritage and should be restored such that can once again beautify the lives and commerce of city dwellers.</p>	<p>Apr 5 2023 10:29AM</p>
Andrew	Gould	21 Catfiddle Street	<p>(Submitting this again to clarify wording - please disregard version submitted earlier): There are many things I like about the proposed Union Pier Development Plan. However, one detail stands out to me as terribly shortsighted. The treatment of the Bennett Rice Mill, as a stabilized ruin, is not the highest and best use for this cultural resource. The main body of this structure should be fully rebuilt. The design is well documented and stood until 1960, when it was ordered demolished by a city that had, at that time, a terrible preservation ethic, and demolished many grand buildings for no other reason than the expense to maintain them. The city should be working to undo that destruction by rebuilding cultural heritage in cases where it can be done accurately and with integrity. The rebuilt rice mill would be an ideal public gathering space for a market hall or food court type of use. The treatment of damaged buildings as stabilized artifacts is an outdated mid-twentieth-century mode of preservation thinking. In Europe, preservationists no longer treat WWII-era ruins in this way. In examples such as Dresden, and increasing all across Europe, damaged buildings are now fully repaired or replicated and put to public use. Historic structures are not artifacts for the contemplation of academics - they are our cultural heritage and should be restored such that can once again beautify the lives and commerce of city dwellers.</p>	<p>Apr 5 2023 10:42AM</p>

Richard	Land	%% Laurens st	No deed for high rise buildings over 2 stories which will block view of harbor from expensive homes in Historic Ansonborough. No deed for more retail shops when 20% of stores are closed/shuttered on King, Meeting and East Bay. Why put cheap Affordable housing on prime waterfront real-estate???	Apr 5 2023 11:01AM
John	Egan	58 Hasell Street, Charleston 29401	The current SBA/Lowe plan for Union Pier adversely affects the Ansonborough neighborhood. The plan overburdens existing streets and has the potential to route traffic through Ansonborough, a quiet residential neighborhood. The Planning Commission should ensure that this will not happen. The current SBA/Lowe plan has insufficient green space/parks. The Planning Commission should require a PUD with more green space and pocket parks. The current SBA/Lowe storm drainage plan potentially adversely affects drainage along East Bay Street (which always floods in heavy rains near Harris Tetter). The Planning Commission should require a PUD that ensures better drainage along East Bay Street and no adverse effects upon Ansonborough. The current SBA/Lowe plan provides for buildings that are too massive in height and scale. Maximum building height in the center of the PUD should not exceed five stories, consistent with the rest of the historic district, and buildings closer to East Bay Street should be scaled back in height to three to four stories.	Apr 5 2023 11:21AM

Sam	Spence	147 King St., Charleston, SC 29401	<p>The following comments are submitted on behalf of the Preservation Society of Charleston: Considering this is one of the most sensitive sites to seek redevelopment in recent history, and the incredibly vulnerable nature of its location right on the waterfront, we urge the Planning Commission to ask detailed, meaningful questions about how and why such significant intensity is proposed especially considering the vulnerability of the project location adjacent to the water and in reclaimed marshland. The Union Pier project presents a unique, complex set of challenges that has drawn a significant amount of public interest for good reason. There are few topics as crucial to get right as threshold questions about design- and density especially considering the lack of any definable vision set forth for the site in the City Plan. Because this plan is promulgated by its presumptive buyer and developer, and because engaging a thorough independent public process will result in a better project, it is absolutely essential for City officials to lead with a values-driven and civically generous approach, keeping in mind the following:</p> <p>URBAN DESIGN -With tall, large floor-plate buildings elevated to 16 feet this project will not integrate with the historic downtown context and potentially wall off our waterfront. We urge you to press on the applicant how the character of the Historic District will be protected, especially given the highly visible nature of this project proposal. -There is a severe lack of real public benefits to offset the sacrifices that will have to be made to accommodate a highly intense and wildly expensive project. Stormwater mitigation and extending the waterfront park are already required, they are not concessions. -Resilience should drive every aspect of the design of the master plan. The city comprehensive plan discourages development in vulnerable areas, acknowledging the inherent risk, not just to the immediate surrounding area. The Union Pier plan appears to ignore that principle, providing near-minimum greenspace alongside dense development in a vulnerable location.</p> <p>DENSITY -This site does not warrant high-density development. Density at this scale runs counter to the City Plan and the proposal makes no effort to lay out a vision for why the City should deviate from its guiding planning documents, which make it clear that its land-use policies should “reduce densities on low-lying areas vulnerable to flooding.” - High-density development could have positive impacts with a diversity of uses and residents, but with just 3% of units affordable and priority given to accommodations, non-owner-occupied residential, retail, and commercial spaces, the corresponding civic benefits of density simply are not present in the plan. Significant contiguous open spaces can function to balance pockets of density if distributed thoughtfully throughout the site.</p> <p>HEIGHT -The City Plan makes it clear that high-density development is appropriate in</p>	Apr 5 2023 11:28AM
-----	--------	--	--	--------------------------

“already-intensely developed areas such as the Meeting/King spine of the Peninsula.” The Union Pier site is neither “already intensely developed” nor along the spine of the peninsula. -Tapering building heights down toward the water’s edge is a well-established principle that guides development in Charleston, yet this plan proposes 6- and 7-story buildings within two blocks of the Cooper River waterfront. As you continue to contemplate this consequential project, we urge you to not lose sight of these critical points: - Union Pier has been a public asset for the people of Charleston and the state of South Carolina for generations. The planned sale marks the final opportunity we have to ensure that the public interest will lead before the site is privatized in perpetuity. It is incumbent on our leaders to lock in those assurances. - The plan seems to hinge on filling the site with truckloads of fill upon which massive, out-of-scale buildings would be built, all while forgoing significant upland open spaces in favor of a spartan hardscaped waterfront and a speculative island park that is not part of the PUD master plan. -Planning Commission members have shown frustration in the past that they cannot consider or review proposed designs as part of their decision-making, unsure of how BAR and BZA will act when projects land on their desks. The Commission now has a chance to build in detailed design guardrails and parameters that address potential problem areas. Relying on the applicant’s recommendations is not sufficient to protect the public interest. We urge you to press for the Planning Department to set out specific and values-driven benchmarks in a comprehensive plan amendment prior to reviewing the current application.

Carrie	Agnew	52 Legare St.	Charleston is in dire need of accessible green space and water views for its citizens. We have enough hotels and high income residential projects. Middle and affordable living spaces with locally owned store fronts and restaurants would be a wonderful and appropriate addition to the community! For the waterfront to be boxed off by 5+ story buildings negates the City’s maritime history, charm and approachable ambiance. There should be docks for people to tie up boats to enjoy the establishments and shopping, apartments and condos that are not for the very rich. Walkways and parks where EVERYONE can appreciate the water views. This should not be a developers means to make big bucks. It should be an area for ALL of Charleston!	Apr 5 2023 11:35AM
--------	-------	---------------	---	--------------------------

Jennifer	Davis	5 Maiden Lane, Charleston SC 29401	<p>The SBA/Lowe plan could and should be so much better. The Planning Commission should require a PUD with green space and parks comprising at least 50% of the Union Pier acreage. Consider modeling the green space and parks after the Botanical Garden in Sydney Australia. Charleston badly needs more downtown park and open space; make this the major focus of the redevelopment. The PUD should enhance and complement Joe Riley's vision of a waterfront walk around the entire peninsula. The PUD should approach storm surge consistent with the approach of the Dutch Dialogs. The scale and height of the buildings in the SBA/Lowe proposal are totally inconsistent with the scale and height of Ansonborough which borders all of Union Pier. The PUD should lower maximum building height and scale down the massing of buildings. The Planning Commission should slow the entire PUD approval process down and get more world-class input on design criteria. Make sure that the Union Pier development enhances Charleston's historic downtown area, and not detracts from it.</p>	Apr 5 2023 11:38AM
----------	-------	---------------------------------------	--	--------------------

Joe & Diane	McGee	1 Magazine, Charleston, SC	<p>I appreciate the process and opportunity for public comment provided by the Planning Commission and supported the Port Authority and their “developer,” Lowe’s Properties. I comment against the current design, density and height characteristics of the current plan. What is the justification for 1,600 units, 600 “more” hotel rooms and minimal affordable housing?? A Union pier covered with numerous seven-story buildings will mar the unique “steeped” skyline that is uniquely the Holy City’s. Consider the mass of multiple seven-story buildings, greater in height than the current Cooper hotel that has risen nearby! Where is the accommodation and plans for more open space, traffic and cycling access? The developer’s claim of significant open space is relegated to a very nice park, but this is space they cannot develop due to coastal regulations. The answer, clearly this a “developer’s” plan, not a living community plan. The entire process is misguided. The community is reacting to a developer’s optimal plan, supported by the freak ownership of the Ports Authority. The process should be the other way around. A community plan first, that considers also development and Port Authority interests. The City needs to take-back this process and put up our own plans. The threat from Mr. Lindsay, (let me broadly characterize) “that the economics demand it or there may not be the redevelopment,” I say “ok,” let that be the case. There current financing that significantly relies on tax increment financing, would “lock-up” additional tax revenues to public jurisdictions for years, so what is the marginal gain to the community? It seems first benefit to the developer, not to community. Need we wait for 20 years, endure a forever destroyed historic skyline, and suffer further congestion without serving the greater good. This is a poor choice. More open space, less height, fewer units, more affordable housing that allows for “mixed” community, that honors the heritage of the site, and a well thought-out transportation plan that ensures access to this unique spot. Let the Port Authority benefit from a reduced sale price, resulting from less dense development, not at the expense to the community and place to which it owes it origin and it’s future and the “gift” of the current property. I have to think there are other, more appropriate state and federal infrastructure funding sources to supplement the Ports ongoing success.</p>	Apr 5 2023 12:00PM
-------------	-------	----------------------------	--	--------------------

Matthew	Thomas	99 Moultrie Street, Charleston, SC	I am against any height above four stories for residential or commercial. I am also against the proposed buildings that take up the entire block. Commercial buildings should be representative of King St, Broad ST, or Market St. Commercial buildings should not be massive, but make up small sections of a block, each commercial building with its own architectural design representative of 1700's and 1800's architecture. The proposed project has way too much buildings and not enough green space. Houses should be representative of what the historical houses of Charleston resemble (Battery Mansions, Charleston Single, Freedman Cottage).	Apr 5 2023 12:45PM
Gary	Crafts	690 LAKE FRANCES DR	What about this project will the Future, future Charlestonians and visitors, thank us for? Will they thank us for 36 acres of private multifamily residential units, 300 hotel rooms, buildings up to 7 stories tall and 500,000 square feet of retail and office space and 19 acres of public open space? I think they will thank us for more public open space and for applying more design features to the building masses, like, perhaps creating an ellipse of open space along the waterfront with building faces creating the inland edge of the ellipse. Reference the Royal Crescent in Bath England.	Mar 27 2023 11:26AM
Gary	Crafts	690 LAKE FRANCES DR	Create stronger connections to Laurens, Society, and Hassell Streets with vegetation along these extensions that are similar to the existing vegetation along these streets in Ansonborough. Create a design element terminus or framed view at the end of the Laurens, Society, and Hassell Street axes. Consider what can be seen across the Cooper River from these terminuses and framed views.	Mar 27 2023 11:28AM
Gary	Crafts	690 LAKE FRANCES DR	Consider what the design elements of this development will look like from the waters of the Cooper River.	Mar 27 2023 11:29AM
Gary	Crafts	690 LAKE FRANCES DR	Perhaps these remarks will be addressed in your presentation: Please present a section view through Ansonborough and continuing through the Union Pier site to the Cooper River. Or present a model showing proposed massing and including houses and buildings in Ansonborough. These will be useful in helping people understand the appearance of the development in the context of the existing environment.	Mar 27 2023 11:31AM
Gary	Crafts	690 LAKE FRANCES DR	Should our planning for Union Pier include the possibility that the State Ports Authority may in the future sell the Columbus Street Terminal for development?	Mar 30 2023 4:17PM