

SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION

February 19, 2020

A special meeting was held this date at 3:30 p.m. at 2 George Street: Public Meeting Room, First Floor.

Notice of this meeting was sent to all local news media.

PRESENT

Mr. Charles Karesh, Chair, Mr. Harry Lesesne, Vice Chair, Ms. Erica Harrison, Dr. Eddie Irions, Jr., Ms. Donna Jacobs, and Mr. Chaun Pflug. **CITY STAFF:** Mr. Jacob Lindsay, Director, Department of Planning, Preservation and Sustainability, Mr. Christopher Morgan, Planning Director, Mr. Philip Overcash, Senior Planner and Ms. Chloe Stuber, Planner.

1. **CHARLESTON CITY PLAN ORIENTATION** - Orientation to the 2020 update of the City's Comprehensive Plan: Charleston City Plan. The orientation will provide an overview of the state requirements for comprehensive plans, the role of Planning Commissioners, a summary of efforts undertaken thus far and the proposed planning schedule for 2020.

Staff Comments: Mr. Lindsay noted the Comprehensive Plan is a guiding plan. The plan has to be reviewed every 5 years and revised every 10 years. 2020 was the revision year.

The plan has 9 elements prescribed by the state:

1. Population
2. Economic Development
3. Natural resources
4. Cultural resources
5. Community facilities
6. Housing
7. Land use
8. Transportation
9. Priority investment

The Staff added *resilience* as the tenth element.

What the plan would do:

- Makes recommendations about future recommendations.
- Uses objective information and analysis.
- Incorporate input from *everyone*.
- Inform daily decisions by the staff.

The plan won't:

- Change zoning, it makes recommendations. Any future changes to zoning which the Commission does with City Council should be based on the plan's recommendation.
- Change stormwater regulations, taxation, how land is used and it doesn't make detailed policy recommendations already covered in other plans.

The purpose of the plan was to improve neighborhood livability and quality of life for all of the residents. The priorities of the plan were: flooding, affordable housing, traffic and public safety. The Staff four guiding principles were: (1) water comes first (2) be smart about data (3) partners in the planning process (4) strength in diversity.

What they will do differently from the Century V Plan:

- Sea Level Rise - will involve localized and sophisticated analysis
- Robust and strategic engagement
- Objective Third Party Input – will bring in people from the outside that are looking at the city's issues fresh
- Plan will be user friendly in print and digital format

Consultants will be hired to fill skill and knowledge gaps in key areas:

- Integrating the Dutch Dialogues
- Analyzing the impacts of sea level rise and climate change
- Analyzing housing affordability and supply
- Assisting staff with the meeting logistics and community engagements
- Assisting with graphics communications

Mr. Lindsay noted consultants would not be the authors of this plan. This plan would be for and by the stakeholders. This was something that would be worked on collaboratively as staff was informed by data.

Community partners are:

- City residents
- Property owners who may not be residents
- Neighborhood Organizations
- Institutions and employers
- Community partners in preservation, housing advocates, people working on flooding, etc.
- Partner Governments – Department of Transportation, County, Council of Governments
- City departments that might not have been a part of this comprehensive planning process

Mr. Lindsay said Mr. Morgan would discuss the timeline and Ms. Stuber would do the engagement process.

Mr. Morgan noted it was important to understand that community partners were people who were part of the meetings they had with the broader community. It would also be people staff brought in for stakeholder discussions regarding certain elements of the plan that might relate to their area of expertise. The Commission members would be the key sounding board, along with the staff, for actually writing the document and looking into what's in the document.

In reference to the additional time commitment that would be asked of the Commission, Mr. Morgan said they could probably have an earlier starting meeting every other month. However, there would also be other meetings in the community where the Commission members were welcomed to attend at their leisure. There would be more hours invested in the duties of the Commission members this year due to the nature of the document. Staff would adjust to accommodate the schedules of the Commission members if there were particular ways they wanted to meet. Staff wanted the Commission members to be more involved and have a sense of ownership of the plan.

Timeline:

- Pre-planning – figuring how to get the consultants, the data needed and compiling data
- Kickoff meetings such as this meeting today, briefing for City Council and neighborhood leaders in March and April
- Community Partner input – multiple levels of stakeholder discussions
- Expert panel civic labs

- Drafting of the plan – gathering all data received and try to put it in a document; bring it out into presentations of drafts, get input on the drafts from the Commission, Council and the public
- Finalization of the actual document that would get the votes from the Commission and then votes from Council for adoption
- Approval might bleed over into 2021 if additional public meetings were needed

Mr. Morgan said staff prep have worked on and continue to work on:

- Data brainstorm sessions
- Best practices research and looking at other plans
- RFP's
- Design studio to assist in framing of the plan
- Values discussions
- Bi-weekly data meetings between different departments that have data that would contribute to the plan

Mr. Lindsay and Allan Davis, director of the Civic Design Center, created an overall map image of the City that would be used as the basis of how maps for the City worked in the plan.

Community Engagement - Ms. Stuber

Ms. Stuber said one of the things that would be different about this plan would be how they approached engagement. Their goals for engagement were:

1. Accessibility – public meeting format works for some but not for others; they were thinking of different ways and different strategies they could engage the public
2. A variety of different opportunities for people to get involved, worked with different schedules and locations
3. Focused.

The key purpose of engagement should be for the public to inform what were the needs, the challenges, the goals and the vision for the City. These were the guiding posts for engagement.

- The heaviest and biggest part of engagement of the year would take place in May and June.
- The kickoff would be the Neighborhood Council Reception (April 16) with the neighborhood leaders. The format would be similar to this special meeting about what to expect this year.
- At the end of that, staff would ask the neighborhood council to help with locations where they should be going to engagement. The purpose was to get the communities involved.
- Neighborhood councils, and community groups, would be asked to host a meeting in their own venues. Staff would distribute meeting-in-a-box, which would have agendas, educational materials and other information to assist with the meeting.
- Staff would offer optional facilitator training for anyone who wants it.
- Anyone was invited to host a meeting-in-a-box for the comprehensive plan.
- Online surveys would be conducted after the neighborhood council reception in April. Links to the survey would be included in the meeting-in-a-box. People could take the survey online the day after the meeting.
- The Learning Tour would run through the end of April into May running into early June. The staff would be learning from the community and educating themselves about the preliminary findings that they have. It was a two way learning tour: what they learned about the City in their research so far and what they wanted to learn from the community.

- Popup engagement or popup stations locations would be determined as they had more conversations with the neighborhoods as to where they could go to the people or where people were already going. Staff could set up a vendor-like table with materials and a staff person to talk and interact with community. Commission members were also invited to come up with ideas for popup locations and be a part of it.

Civic Labs (June 24-26) – Mr. Lindsay

They were going to have engaged civic labs with international and local leaders for a few days to engage with stakeholders and the public about their topics of specialization (flooding, affordable housing, water) to get some best in class input into what they were doing and have them look at the plan to tell them if it was in line with best practices nationally.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Marcia L. Grant
Administrative Assistant II

PLANNING COMMISSION

February 19, 2020

A meeting of the Planning Commission was held this date at 5:00 p.m. at 2 George Street: Public Meeting Room, First Floor.

Notice of the meetings was sent to all local news media.

PRESENT

Mr. Charles Karesh, Chair, Mr. Harry Lesesne, Vice Chair, Mr. Jimmy Bailey, Jr., Ms. Erica Harrison, Dr. Eddie Irions, Jr., Ms. Donna Jacobs, Mrs. Angie Johnson, Ms. Sunday Lempeis and Mr. Chaun Pflug. **CITY STAFF:** Mr. Christopher Morgan, Planning Director, Mr. Philip Overcash, Senior Planner and Ms. Chloe Stuber, Planner.

Chair Karesh explained the rules of procedure.

Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Lesesne moved for approval of the January 15, 2020 minutes.

Ms. Jacobs seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved unanimously.

The following items were deferred:

REZONINGS

3. To rezone Laurel Island (Approx. 196.1 acres) (TMS # 464-00-00-006, 002, 023, 038, 459-02-00-013, and 461-13-93-924 from General Business (GB), Heavy Industrial (HI), Upper Peninsula (UP) and Diverse Residential (DR-3) classifications to Planned Unit Development (PUD) (Laurel Island).
Deferred
5. To rezone 295 Calhoun Street (*Harleston Village – Peninsula*) (Approx. 2.1 acres) (TMS # 457-02-02-001) from Height District 85/30 (85 feet/30 feet) Classification to Height District 7 (7 stories) Classification. Owner: MUSC Applicant: Same as owner **Deferred**

ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

2. An ordinance to amend Chapter 54 of the Code of the City of Charleston (Zoning Ordinance) by deleting Part 16 Cluster Development, and replacing said part with a new Part 16 Conservation Development, to increase provisions to preserve natural features of the existing landscape; allow for a variety of housing types; reaffirm the importance of smart and creative stormwater management that integrates natural systems and minimizes impervious surfaces; and provide for the incorporation of low-impact development techniques to support overall health and sustainability of the neighborhood. **Deferred**

Mr. Morgan presented the rezonings and zonings. Mrs. Harp presented the subdivision and Mr. Morgan and Mrs. Harp presented the ordinance amendments.

REZONINGS

1. To rezone a portion of 1320 King Street Extension (*Silver Hill/Magnolia - Peninsula*) (Approx. 0.94 acre) (TMS # 464-140-01-91) from 8 and 2.5 Old City Height District Classification to 4-12 Old City Height District Classification. Owner: Berkeley Charleston Dorchester Council of Governments (BCDCOG) Applicant: City of Charleston

Mr. Pflug recused himself and left the meeting room.

Staff Presentation: Properties were formerly Norfolk Southern Rail line that were acquired by the Lowcountry Lowline. It had gone to the Berkeley Charleston Dorchester Council of Governments (BCDCOG) for transit use that would be integrated with the lowline. The property needed to be zoned because as rail areas they weren't zoned. They were included in areas with height limits, which was why this item was a rezoning. The rezoning would change the entire height district to 4-12 Old City Height District. Staff recommended approval.

In Favor: City Staff was applicant

Opposed: None

Motion: Mr. Lesesne moved for approval.

Second: Mrs. Johnson

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Pflug returned at 5:12 p.m.

2. To rezone 220 Nassau Street (*Meeting Street Manor/Cooper River Court – Peninsula*) (Approx. 0.89 acres) (TMS # 459-05-01-067) from Diverse Residential (DR-2) classification to Mixed-Use/Workforce Housing (MU-1/WH) classification. Owner: Charleston County School District Applicant: Humanities Foundation, Inc.

Staff Presentation: The property was the former Henry P. Archer Elementary School. The Humanities Foundation was in discussions with the County about the purchase of the site. The site would be used for workforce housing but more density would be needed to make it work for affordable housing. The Property was well connected to transit, shopping and workplaces. The property was in the area of urban designation and was adjacent to Urban Core. Staff recommended approval.

In Favor: Tracy Doran, co-founder and president, Humanities Foundation:

- Looking at ADA apartments for seniors and veterans
- Renovating the school and doing new construction on the site
- Will have resident services
- Met with neighborhood president and several stakeholders to explain the development
- Unable to get to a neighborhood meeting as president was out of town
- Worked with Rev. Rivers of St. Johns Chapel
- Will meet with neighborhood association March 23. President was supposed to send letter in support

Opposed: None

Chair Karesh closed the public hearing.

Motion: Mr. Lesesne moved for approval.

Second: Mrs. Johnson

The motion passed unanimously.

4. To rezone Ashley River Road (*West Ashley*) Approx. 1.53 acres) (TMS # 354-12-00-004) from Single-Family Residential (SR-1) classification to Limited Business (LB) classification. Owner: Laura M. Smith Applicant: Same as owner.

Staff Presentation: Staff don't know why property remained SR-1 for this long. Staff felt surrounding intense multifamily and LB across the street to the east justified taking property above what would normally be in a suburban location. Staff recommended approval.

In Favor: No one spoke for or against the request.

Chair Karesh closed the public hearing.

Motion: Mr. Lesesne moved for approval.

Second: Mrs. Johnson

The motion passed unanimously.

6. To rezone 625 Saint Andrews Boulevard (*Westwood – West Ashley*) (Approx. 0.33 acre) (TMS # 421-02-00-240) from Single-family Residential (SR-2) classification to Residential Office (RO) classification. Owner: Dennis Howard Taylor Applicant Jared Rahanmoon

Staff Presentation: A single-family structure was on the site. General Office was across the street and Residential Office was further down the street. Everything down to the southeast was residential. In Century V plan in the suburban category Residential Office would be an appropriate use within suburban category there. Staff wanted to be supportive to the neighborhood. The property was in the area of the Ashley Bridge District where there was concern about conversion of houses fronting on St. Andrews Boulevard and Savannah Highway

to offices. They desired to keep the residential character of the area. Staff wasn't comfortable with the request and recommended disapproval.

In Favor: Jared Rahanmoon, owner and operator of Charleston Empire Properties:

- They knocked on the doors of all of the neighbors regarding this property. Spoke to Mr. Morgan and City Council.
- Property was very distressed. There had been numerous police calls for probation violations and drug use. Parked cars were piled up there.
- Had two of four adjoining property owners signed off in agreement. Approximately ten other people in the neighborhood. Those who signed lived close to the property. Those who were opposed lived further away.
- Day to day operation wouldn't conflict with current traffic involved by the school
- Inquired about putting a light at that spot but he was told the likeliness of happening would be little to none
- He did provide a survey where he would have a reasonable amount of maneuverable parking
- His boutique brokerage business was small with five agents; they held one team meeting a week during the middle of the day
- Rudy Frierson, St. Denis Drive, Moreland:
- The neighborhood had been trying to get rid of Mr. Taylor for some time; they didn't like him nor his Christmas decorations
- There were two companies adjacent to Mr. Taylor's house on the left
- Mr. Taylor's residence isn't on Moore Drive, his backyard was on Moore Drive; the entrance to his residence was on St. Andrews Boulevard; this made a difference because Moore Drive didn't start until you got to the circle
- He would like to see it rezoned; this was the only house that was residential and he didn't think it qualified to be there; he thought it should be a business

Opposed: Robin Zip, 4 St. Theresa Drive, Westwood

- Regardless of the appearance of the property, whether it was in bad condition, he didn't think the solution to improving it was by changing the zoning
- He didn't think the property hadn't been put on the market
- He understood the City committed to maintaining the character of established when considering land use
- The strip along the highway from this property down to Harrison Road was the only remaining exclusively residential area along St. Andrews Boulevard; the house was on the boundary
- Changing the zoning would push commercialization of St. Andrews Boulevard further towards the peninsula
- Every property in Westwood was zoned SR-1; changing this one wouldn't be in compliance with that; would decrease property values and erode the quality of life in this residential neighborhood

John DeMetrie, resident of Westwood and former Westwood representative to the Ashley River Bridge District:

- Home is 100 feet from subject property
- Subject property was single family residence for 70 years
- To suggest that in order to be a viable property was to convert it to a business was shortsighted
- Would open door to requests from other speculators
- This was one of the worst intersections to exit the neighborhood; parked vehicles block view
- Business on that corner would make bad situation worse
- Nancy Whittier, president of Westwood Neighborhood Association:

- House adjacent to subject property was in Avondale, not Westwood
- Adding traffic to the neighborhood would be safety issue for children playing
- Although Mr. Rahanmoon said he would ask them to exit through St. Andrews Boulevard but it was closer to go through the neighborhood and exit at Highway 17
- She liked Mr. Taylor; he left the property for a dryer climate at doctor's suggestion
- She didn't think residential office was the only option
- If the backyard was paved it would change how the rain flowed in the neighborhood and might cause flooding issues for that end of the neighborhood
- Felt it should be kept residential

Martin Jensen, resident of Westwood:

- Commercial they were referencing was in Avondale because it was in the County not the City
- 50% of Avondale was still in the county
- He wanted to see it stay the way it was

Robert Gruber, 15 Moore Drive:

- 625 St. Andrews Boulevard is an eyesore
- Walked the property and it was huge; good bit of setback from St. Andrews Boulevard;
- Applicant was going to use the existing driveway on Moore Drive that was on the spur; didn't see an application to do a curb cut through onto the St. Andrews Boulevard similar to building next door
- Existing pad in backyard would need to be replaced for parking; Concerned if it wasn't the business that located there it wouldn't look much better than what's there currently
- Points made regarding the City's intent to keep the residential neighborhoods residential, asked staff to consider that
- Think applicant's business should be in an area that already had businesses

Rebuttal: Mr. Rahanmoon:

- Backyard was already concreted; dilapidated carport would be demolished
- Nothing was done with the flooding until gentleman with political ties in the neighborhood called and got something done
- Felt nothing got elevated with the opposition until same gentleman called; more of a political battle
- The property to the right was used as an office; the property owner behind it adjoining the subject property, which would have the most impact, was in favor of the rezoning but was unable to attend
- He felt he had a lot of adjoining the neighbors in favor but understood other residents opposition
- He wanted to put deed restriction on the property to ensure it could never be up zoned.
- Not opposed to curb cut but was a long process
- No one would pay the price for the property to live there; had hardship and better suited for business; not many families would want to live right on St. Andrews Boulevard

Chair Karesh closed public hearing. He noted they got a number of letters in opposition.

Motion: Ms. Jacobs moved for staff recommendation for disapproval.

Second: Mrs. Johnson

The motion for disapproval passed unanimously.

7. To rezone 1970 Delaney Drive (*James Island*) (Approx. 0.303 acre) (TMS # 340-00-00-099) from Single-Family Residential (SR-1) classification to Single-Family Residential (SR-4) classification. Owner: Jesse J. Richardson Applicant: Same as owner

Staff Presentation: The property was in a suburban edge area. The owner wanted to subdivide the lot. A two-story duplex had been built on the property. Staff felt comfortable with recommending approval to the application because of the diverse surrounding area.

In Favor: Crystal Richardson, 1954 Delaney Drive, representing the applicant, her brother:

- Mr. Richardson wanted to tear down the duplex and build another duplex. Ms. Richardson wanted to subdivide the property to build a single-family home

Opposed: None

Chair Karesh closed the public hearing.

Motion: Mrs. Johnson moved for approval.

Second: Mr. Lesesne

The motion passed unanimously.

SUBDIVISION

1. Maybank Highway (*Indigo Grove – Johns Island*) (32.83 acres) (TMS # 345-00-00-090) 118 lots. Request for subdivision concept plan approval. Zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD - Kerr Tract). Owner: RHK, LLC Applicant: Seamon Whiteside and Associates

Staff Presentation: The project proposed the creation of a right-of-way that would serve 118 single-family attached and detached residential units. The right-of-way and the parcels met the subdivision requirements in the PUD. Surrounding existing uses included multifamily and single-family residential. Commercial uses were proposed as future development continued. There were some wetlands on the property and some of them would be impacted by this subdivision.

The subdivision concept had been reviewed by Technical Review Committee (TRC). Everything had been approved for the concept plan. The review process would continue as the process moved forward. Additional comments would be provided with a review of the preliminary plat and road construction plan. It might have an impact on the layout. Staff recommended approval of the subdivision concept plan with the following conditions:

- The road construction plan and the preliminary plat must be designed in accordance with the minimum requirements of the stormwater design standards manual
- All the names for the streets must be approved by the 911 standards and any new street names must be approved by the Charleston County Consolidated 911 Office
- The Kerr PUD tract required stand up curb when curb and gutter was used. Any use of different type of curb was subject to approval of the Zoning Administrator during the TRC process

In Favor: Mark Lipsmeyer, a resident of James Island:

- Worked with City staff over the years to ensure the design met City's criteria; and that they detected and alleviated the grand trees and drainage situation
- PUD and concept plan was approved in May 2019
- Dramatically reduced the density that was allowed at the tine side of the pitchfork on Johns Island
- Donated the right-of-way to the City of Charleston for the future construction of the southern tine of the pitchfork
- Worked with side by side with James Island Community Association for a year and half to address their concerns

Mr. Lipsmeyer asked the Commission for approval.

Russ Seamon of Seamon Whiteside:

- Plan was environmentally sensitive; concept driven by incorporating tree save areas into the open spaces; saving approximately 180 quality grand trees with this layout
- Exceeding open space requirements for both useable and total open space by several acres
- Working around historic indigo vat and incorporating it into a big park

- Made the design where it could tie into future the City of Charleston pitchfork road
- PUD allowed 215 units; they proposed 112 units
- Included grading plan based on the number of trees

Patterson Farmer of Seamon Whiteside:

- Low impact development plan incorporated drop ons, swales, infiltration basins where permissible
- Main swale through the site was going to reduce staging in the post development from one feet to two feet

Opposed: None

Chair Karesh closed the public hearing.

Motion: Mr. Lesesne moved for approval with conditions

Second: Ms. Harrison

The motion passed unanimously.

ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

1. To amend an ordinance providing for an amendment of the Daniel Island Master Plan Section 3.2(4)(2)(7) by deleting “or day care facilities” and adding attached Section 3.2(4)(8) “Day care facility.” Owner: The Daniel Island Company Applicant: Chad Colman

Staff Presentation: Currently a daycare facility was only allowed as an accessory use. The change would allow it to be a stand-alone principle use.

In Favor: Chad Colman, resident of Daniel Island:

- There is a single daycare on the island; has a waiting list; doesn't provide infant care;
- Issue was brought up by the employers on Daniel Island to the Company; they have no access to infant care or daycare
- Daniel Island General Office allows for it as an accessory use but there wasn't a large enough employer to have it as an accessory use
- Asking for Daniel Island General Office to allow daycare as a stand-alone use that had the same proximity to the day time workforce at Town Center and had the same access to I-526

Mr. Coleman said he also had a letter from Jane Baker.

Opposed: None

Chair Karesh closed the public hearing.

Motion: Ms. Jacobs moved for approval.

Second: Mrs. Johnson

The motion passed unanimously.

3. To amend Chapter 54 of the Code of the City of Charleston (Zoning Ordinance) by amending applicable sections related to Planning Commission composition to establish commission member alternates and to update other applicable sections related to Planning Commission rules and procedures.

Staff Presentation: The amendment brought some of the Planning Commission rules of procedures into the 21st century and allowed for two alternates added to the Commission. It would be for Commission members who were ill or unable to attend the meetings. It would assure a quorum of nine members serving at each meeting. This was done with the Board of Architectural Review and Design Review Board. Staff would only choose to send people who had a good knowledge of planning and zoning to Council as nominees for these alternate positions, such as Yvonne Fortenberry, former director of Planning, and Cathy Klineman, who had done much affordable housing development.

Commission members made the following comments regarding possible changes or additions to ordinance:

- Criteria for credentials
- Alternates shouldn't be merged in and tied into part A
- Alternates be involved in the process of the plans
- Invite alternates to workshops
- AICP be one of the qualifications for an alternate
- More specific language needed regarding when an alternate is seated
- Alternates should have backgrounds in planning and land use

Chair Karesh closed the public hearing.

Motion: Ms. Harrison moved for deferral.

Second: Mr. Lesesne

The motion to defer passed unanimously.

4. To amend Chapter 54 of the Code of the City of Charleston (Zoning Ordinance) by amending Section 54-220 Accommodations Overlay Zone for corrections and clarifications.

Staff Presentation: When the accommodations was going to Council, there were a few last minute changes made by legal staff. Upon further review, the legal staff determined the phrase "*any accommodations use on the peninsula*" could disallow any full service hotels from being located. Staff felt they needed to change this now. The Hotel Task Force will meet probably sometime within the next month for some more discussion regarding the accommodations overlay.

In Favor: No one spoke for or against the request.

Chair Karesh closed the public hearing.

Motion: Mr. Lesesne moved for approval.

Second: Mrs. Johnson

The motion passed unanimously.

ZONINGS

To zone the following properties annexed into the City of Charleston:

Mr. Pflug recused himself on item #1 and left the room.

1. 1320 King Street Extension (*Silver Hill/Magnolia - Peninsula*) (Approx. 1.50 acres) (TMS # 464-14-00-191) Upper Peninsula District (UP). Previously unzoned right-of-way. Owner: BCDCOG Applicant: City of Charleston

Staff Presentation: The height district was set earlier in the rezoning. This would set the zoning for it in the UP district. Staff recommended approval.

In Favor: No one spoke for or against the request.

Chair Karesh closed the public hearing.

Motion: Mr. Bailey moved for approval.

Second: Mr. Lesesne

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Pflug returned to the room at 6:40 p.m.

2. A portion of Bender Street (*Maryville/Ashleyville - West Ashley*) (Approx. 0.13 acre) TMS # to be assigned Single-Family Residential (SR-2). Previously unzoned right-of-way. Owner: City of Charleston Applicant: City of Charleston

Staff Presentation: City acquired this property for the Bender Street Park. The thought was if they needed to zone the right-of-way, if it wasn't zoned in the past, this would be part of the future park. Staff recommended approval.

In Favor: No one spoke for or against the request.

Chair Karesh closed the public hearing.

Motion: Mr. Bailey moved for approval.

Second: Mrs. Johnson

The motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:42 p.m.

Marcia L. Grant
Administrative Assistant II