

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

March 10, 2020

A meeting of the Committee on Traffic and Transportation was held this date beginning at 3:45 p.m., at City Hall, 80 Broad Street, First Floor Conference Room

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

PRESENT

Councilmember Seekings, Chair; Councilmember Brady, Councilwoman Jackson, Councilwoman Delcioppo, and Mayor Tecklenburg **Present:** Robbie Somerville, Keith Benjamin, Kelsey Sanna, Tracy McKee, Rick Jerue, Janie Borden, Councilmember Sakran, Councilmember Shealy, and Bethany Whitaker, Council Secretary **Also Present:** Angela Ray and Scott Mansedy (Residents)

The meeting was opened with an invocation provided by Councilwoman Jackson.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On the motion of Councilmember Brady, seconded by Councilwoman Delcioppo, the Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the February 25, 2020 meeting.

Appeal – Denial of District I Residential Parking Decal, 63 South Street, Apt. B

Chairman Seekings said that he would let Ms. Borden introduce this. Ms. Borden stated this was an appeal from a denial of an additional residential parking permit for 63 South Street. The appellant was there and the City of Charleston was there to present the case. Chairman Seekings stated that the way the procedure worked was that any appeal of the residential parking decal denials came through the Traffic and Transportation Committee for review. It was a sort of quasi-judicial proceeding. They would give the appellants five minutes to present their case, and then the City's representative would present the City's case.

Angela Ray, Appellant, stated she was also joined by Scott Manseny. They lived on South Street and she was a law student. She had one more year of Law School and they were hoping to stay in their current location for another year. Mr. Manseny was a banker and worked in Mt. Pleasant. They moved to South Street on August 1st. There were four people living in the apartment. They knew they would only be able to have two parking passes per the ordinance. South Street was free parking at the time, and that was part of why they chose to live there. The other two students could park on the street and they would all have parking. Around January, it started to become enforced that parking was not free anymore and it was a residential street. They were told that there were meetings and the South Street community was actually who elected it. However, they didn't receive any mail or email. Their landlord was supposed to be there that day, but got tied up. He hadn't informed them of anything. He had said he wasn't informed. They would've been at those meetings had they known to voice their concern for the parking issue. Mr. Manseny had been having to leave his car at work and she was having to travel back and forth. Her other roommate parked at school, however the parking lot she parked in could no longer guarantee parking because they were selling the lot. They would love to stay on their lease for another year, but if they could get an additional two parking passes for the remainder of the year, even that would be helpful if they couldn't be granted another two for the full year of the lease.

Councilwoman Jackson asked how a parking pass worked. Chairman Seekings said they were in a residential parking district that was recently created. It was Parking District I. If you were in a district, you had to park on

the street with a decal/permit. Chairman Seekings asked who the landlord was. Ms. Ray said it was Reid Walker. Chairman Seekings asked if they had discussed this with him and Ms. Ray said they had.

Ms. Borden, on behalf of the City, stated that the appellants moved in on August 1st, 2019. The residential district was actually created in 2017. Signs were put up more recently, but that didn't mean the law wasn't in effect. It had been in effect since it was adopted in 2017 and clearly indicated that South Street was included in the residential district. Not every residential street in a residential parking area contained a sign. To do so would obliterate all the streets with signage. Therefore, they did signed streets when requested by a neighborhood. They had a representative there from the neighborhood. The neighborhood had worked with Councilmember Mitchell to put up the signs and create the residential district. They asked that the denial be upheld. It was given in accordance to the City's ordinances that only permitted two residential parking permits per TMS. They already had two and while they had more residents residing than parking permits, the point was they had to find alternative parking solutions. Mayor Tecklenburg asked if there were nearby streets that were not in the parking district where they could park their car. Mr. Somerville said of the top of his head, America Street would probably be the closest where it was unrestricted. The right/east side of America Street was unrestricted. He had the Neighborhood President there that could speak to the notifications they had put out prior to South Street and others being declared residential. Chairman Seekings said that the way he understood it, the appellant wasn't complaining about the residential district. They just wanted two additional passes. He thought they were limited in that scope.

LaTonya Gamble, Eastside Neighborhood Association President, stated that South Street hadn't gotten their parking decals until January. It hadn't been enforced up to that point. They were given a month a half grace period. The City had helped with the papering. They had been trying to get residential parking for years and she thought it would set a precedent if the appellant was given two additional passes. A lot of people had more than two cars at their residence, and if they set the precedent, everyone would want the extra passes. She, personally, had gone on South Street to help with papering. The landlord had attended some of the meetings, so he knew that the residential parking was coming. It had been on Facebook. Other people on South Street knew that this was coming.

Ms. Ray, Appellant, stated that the only thing she wanted to say was that she heard that the district started in January, but Ms. Borden had stated the district started in 2017. That was conflicting. Councilmember Brady asked if they were bound by the precedent or if it was an individual case basis. Chairman Seeking said that the short answer of if this would be precedent setting was 'yes'. Councilwoman Jackson stated that she applauded the initiative of the appellants. Anytime someone came to a body like that and made a case, in human nature, they wanted to honor that, but she was concerned about the precedent that could be set. They knew the neighborhoods were becoming more densely populated. Developers were trying to figure out how to park as many cars as possible in neighborhoods. Mayor Tecklenburg said that he would suggest that, in addition to some nearby streets, there were some alternatives. This same issue came up with a business on Columbus Street and they requested special exception to their limitations, and the City had directed them a few blocks away where they could legally park. There were some property owners and parking garages not too far away. He would suggest talking to their landlord, and have him adjust their rent for the increased parking cost if they ended up incurring any. Chairman Seekings thanked the appellants for coming. He applauded their initiative. With the addition of Parking District I, they now had nine parking districts on the Peninsula. There were more people that could get passes in those districts than there were actual parking spaces. They had limited everybody, homeowner and renter, to two parking decals. If they added stickers to

any particular property, they would be setting a precedent and would have a problem. Parking was very difficult and he suspected that the result was going to encourage them to look for alternatives.

On the motion of Councilwoman Jackson, seconded by Mayor Tecklenburg, the Committee voted unanimously to deny the appeal of a denial of parking decals in District I.

Traffic Calming Speed Humps for Approval

a. Eastside Neighborhood – Aiken Street

b. North Central Neighborhood – Magnolia Avenue

Mr. Somerville stated that both of these applications met the 75% petition requirement. He had worked with Ms. Gamble on placing the speed humps. They were requesting approval.

Chairman Seekings asked where they were in the budget at this time. Mr. Somerville said he believed they had spent right around \$39,000 on nine speed humps. They had been approved for \$111,000 for the year. Mr. Benjamin said they had received a lot of requests, close to \$200,000 in requests for traffic calming. However, the citizens who had made those requests had not necessarily gotten their petitions. They wanted and needed to follow up with those citizens. Chairman Seekings asked if they had notified the residents that were adjacent to the speed hump locations. Mr. Somerville stated that they would reach out to Police, Fire, and the residents once they had locations for the humps.

On the motion of Councilwoman Jackson, seconded by Mayor Tecklenburg, the Committee voted unanimously to approve the above Traffic Calming Speed Humps.

Director's Update

Mr. Benjamin stated that that week, the CHATS Policy Committee/Board approved Complete Streets funding for the Maybank Corridor. That was officially funded. A project that had originally started as \$200,000 was now \$1.2 million to help that corridor. They also had the Road Safety Audits for Calhoun/St. Philip. It was just the preliminary walk-throughs. SCDOT did want to come before the Committee for the Road Safety Audits that were conducted for Meeting and King Streets to present some of their recommendations and give them a chance to ask about how the \$5 million per year would be spent from the ten-year plan. There were some bridge improvements that would be happening to a number of the bridges in the City, including the James Island Connector. They would be working on the Connector from mid-March through mid-May during the night. Council had funded positions for them and they had been working on getting those positions filled. The 526-Lowcountry East community meetings would be happening soon and they needed to make sure their voices were heard and included there. They would be discussing what to do with the bridges at those meetings and in the future.

Councilwoman Jackson asked if the City took an official position on the 526 expansions. Mr. Benjamin said he wasn't sure about City position, but the project managers came to the City and allowed the City to weigh in on the project. He hadn't received requests to go on record or send letters. What had occurred thus far, was them receiving the preliminaries and being able to comment on what was right and what needed to change. For example, the Paul Cantrell and Magwood intersection, what they currently had proposed was not something the City favored. They made that clear. Councilwoman Jackson said that there was a movement in citizen groups to ask DOT to go back to the drawing board

for the west expansion. She wanted to know if they had joined in that agreement. Mr. Benjamin said he wasn't aware of them being asked to, at least on his side. He hadn't received a formal request.

Having no further business, the Committee adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

Bethany Whitaker

Council Secretary