



CITY OF CHARLESTON PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC COMMENT NOVEMBER 16, 2022

A meeting of the Planning Commission will be held on **Wednesday, November 16, 2022** at **5:00 p.m.** in the **Public Meeting Room, First Floor, 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 in advance of the meeting. Please check the website on the meeting date to view any withdrawn or deferred agenda items.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

PUBLIC MEETING ACCOMMODATIONS:

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, people who need alternative formats, ASL (American Sign Language) Interpretation, or other accommodation, should please contact Janet Schumacher at 843-577-1389 or schumacherj@charleston-sc.gov three business days prior to the meeting.

**City of Charleston Planning Commission
November 16, 2022 Meeting**

Public Comment for Rezoning #1: Property on Southwick Drive

Fenwick Hills - Johns Island | TMS # 2790000018 | Approx. 60.61 ac.

Request rezoning from Single Family Residential (SR-1) to Conservation (C - approx. 22.35 ac.) and Diverse Residential (DR-6 - approx. 38.26).

Owner: Fenwick Hills Corp | Applicant: Middleburg Communities

No Comments Submitted in Support | 41 Comments Submitted in Opposition

First Name	Last Name	Address	Submitted Comment	Support/ Opposed	Date/Time Submitted
------------	-----------	---------	-------------------	---------------------	------------------------

No Comments Submitted in Support

Comments Submitted in Opposition: 41

Suzanne	Olvera	1557 Traywick Ave Johns Island SC 29455	When this developer was approved for Phase 1 of this project, they assured the public and the commission that they would not be filling any wetlands, but now I see that they are planning on filling in wetlands on the new phase on Southwick. Please consider turning down this request. First of all, this neighborhood is already experiencing flooding from all of the cleared wooded lots and the new development, especially along Southwick but filling in wetlands will only cause more flooding problems. Second, the infrastructure in this area is not ready to support all of the units the developer is planning on building in this spot. The corner of Southwick and Maybank is becoming a dangerous spot to try and pull out and I can't even imagine how much worse it will be with the addition of multi family units. Third, the community is strongly against this project! Please listen to the community and think about what this will do to the quality of life in our area. It would be irresponsible to approve this.	Opposed	Nov 4 2022 1:14PM
---------	--------	---	---	---------	-------------------------

Leslie	Hucks	3287 Dunwick Dr, Johns Island	The volume of traffic entering Maybank Hwy from Southwick Dr is already too much for the intersection to handle, especially with the new shopping development opposite Southwick Dr. Rezoning the property from single-family residences to multi-family residences or similar will further increase the traffic at this intersection. The addition of the middle turn lane on Maybank helps but is not adequate to safely handle the volume of traffic. Additionally, a large portion of the property is wetlands and should not be filled, as doing so could cause runoff issues in the neighboring areas which already hold water during heavy rainstorms. As a resident of this immediate area since 2015, I am strongly opposed to further development along this small road.	Opposed	Nov 4 2022 6:17PM
Justin	Follmer	1606 Fishbone Drive, Johns Island, SC 29455	I request that City of Charleston Councilmembers vote NO to the rezoning request being submitted. The additional 32 homes that are being sought after will bring hundreds of additional cars through the dangerous intersection of Southwick Rd and Maybank highway. Furthermore, this area of wetlands are needed to help the existing flooding issues already present in surrounding communities. These additional homes will only exacerbate the problems that Johns Island faces: over-development without a master plan on coincidental upgrades and planning of road and infrastructure improvements. It is imperative that our elected councilmembers finally stand up and use this opportunity to say NO to this rezoning request.	Opposed	Nov 7 2022 11:12AM

Kristina	Harvey	3208 Dunwick Dr	<p>I strongly oppose rezoning the property zoning to increase density. The applicant/developer representative(s) at neighborhood meeting, 11/09/2022, said this would be phase two of current Hamlet at Maybank housing development and using the same townhome products to continue feel of the [phase one] development. But disappointingly on the plan presented for this next Phase two for which they are seeking higher density zoning, there are 0% of the prominent 2-unit duplexes and only 25%, or 7 of 28 bldgs, use of the 4-unit buildings used [in phase one]. The most used building type proposed in this next phase is 6-unit building at 75%, or 21 of 28 buildings, which are not used anywhere in the [phase one] Hamlet development and would be more appropriate in that 'Neighborhood' use areas of the City Plan Future Land Use instead of the Southwick property's 'Suburban' designation. These closely spaced townhome buildings and roads do not take into account the very high potential of existing large, grand trees in good health through these currently wooded upland property which the City would prioritize to remain and buildings shifted or removed. These 'extra' units allowed if increase zoning would not be in keeping with the initial Hamlet development but rather serving to add extra profit for the builders. Additionally, the current state of roads and infrastructure to this area of Southwick and Fenwick Hills/Wood neighborhood is already congested, reaching maximum daily traffic trips at peak commuting hours. So increasing this zoning beyond SR-1 zoning will not best serve the current residents and adjacent communities.</p>	Opposed	Nov 9 2022 9:48PM
----------	--------	--------------------	---	---------	-------------------------

Michael	Mattox	1623 Southwick Dr. Johns Island, SC 29455	<p>The request to rezone the acreage adjacent to Southwick Dr and the proposed plan to develop it is not an acceptable solution for the residents surrounding this property. The amount of traffic that is already present on Southwick Drive has resulted in an extremely deteriorated road surface. Adding additional traffic with exits from the proposed development onto Southwick will only exacerbate the situation. The property currently provides a buffer from the traffic noise from Maybank Highway but this rezoning and based on the developer's plan would result in the elimination of a majority of the trees within the property. This action will only make the noise pollution worse for surrounding residents. The flooding between Traywick and Southwick and potentially other streets that exit to Southwick is only mitigated by runoff ditches on the side of the proposed rezoned property. If a new development is added with the amount of paving that is anticipated along with road access from the development onto Southwick, the new development will find itself flooded after the first heavy rainfall. This property serves several different purposes including buffering of noise from an already overly trafficked highway to a location for flood water to be absorbed/drained from existing residential properties. This rezoning cannot be allowed nor can the extent of development be allowed. The area is already stressed at this point. Any new large scale multifamily development will create a situation that can not be resolved.</p>	Opposed	Nov 11 2022 4:08PM
Julianna	Herndon	1628 Fishbone Dr	<p>I oppose any upzoning in the Johns Island area. We simply do not have the infrastructure for existing residents, to upzone and allow additional density is just exacerbating a problem that no one is in a rush to solve. Not to mention traffic in this area is already a large problem.</p>	Opposed	Nov 11 2022 9:13AM
Zach	Mathis	1861 Towne Street, Johns Island	<p>I oppose any additional density on Johns Island, particularly in this area. Our roads are at capacity and improvements need to be made for existing residents and current construction before we continue adding to the problem.</p>	Opposed	Nov 11 2022 9:14AM
John	Bankowski	1250 Hammrick Lane, Johns Island	<p>This area is heavily congested; adding additional zoning capacity should not be entertained as the area cannot support it.</p>	Opposed	Nov 11 2022 9:31AM

Lisa	berl	5012 Coral Reef Dr	The overdevelopment of Johns Island must stop. Traffic and traffic accidents have paralyzed the Island too many times. Continued disregard to our lack of infrastructure while overbuilding the Island lacks foresight. The amount of homes and condos built in the last 2 years is more than sufficient. STOP please consider our neighbors.	Opposed	Nov 12 2022 9:42AM
Pam	Sonnefeld	2763 Summertrees Blvd	We have enough traffic on Johns Island as it is. Please do not make this a multi family development. It not only creates more traffic but cause flooding in the area and rake away wildlife habitat.	Opposed	Nov 12 2022 10:39PM
Charles	Ruggiero	3513 Gatetree Rd, Johns Island SC 29455	Additional development of Johns Island is destroying the character and beauty of the island and will soon result in the area being undesirable to residents as well as tourist which results in a loss of revenue to business and government. Uncontrolled development adds stress to the an overburdened infrastructure, displace wild life resulting in animal intrusion in populated areas with danger to humans as well as the animals, Flooding hazard, traffic congestion, schools, water, sewage and electrical systems which in turn causes excessive tax increase. Evacuation of the island when needed will become impossible resulting in injury and the loss of life.	Opposed	Nov 12 2022 12:32PM
Bruce	Hoch	1617 Southwick Dr	I strongly oppose Rezoning to DR-6 for these reasons: - The Developer will pack up to 180 townhouses on the only high land in the middle of our Natural Wetlands and Animal Habitat! - This could add up to 350 cars exiting onto Southwick Drive! - The addition of fill, concrete and deforestation could disturb the natural drainage into Church Creek and could cause flooding. PLEASE DENY THIS CHANGE!	Opposed	Nov 13 2022 7:46AM
Rebecca	Ruttiger	3231 Cape Rd, Johns Island, SC 29455	Continuing large scale development anywhere on John’s Island at this time is dangerous and irresponsible. From a traffic/pedestrian and environmental standpoint, this area is unable to continue to support the amount of residential development. The infrastructure is not in place to handle this type of additional growth without causing a major impact to current residents. Roads are already overloaded, grocery stores already have empty shelves, daily multiple animals are found dead from getting hit by cars, and properties that have never flooded before are now flooding. Stop! Take a break! Get some new processes in place and then decide what will fit best for the area. Not the other way around.	Opposed	Nov 13 2022 8:04AM

Diane	Hoch	1617 Southwick Drive	<p>Would like it noted...if zoning change is approved it will be beyond "intentional negligence " given all the local residents information about the dangers of both Southwick traffic as well as the intersection of Maybank & Southwick for current traffic concerns. More development on natural wetlands as per the dutchs input being totally ignored should in fact lead to a class action suit due to the irresponsibly of both the planning committee & the city in general.</p> <p>Enough is Enough in the "over development" of Johns Island without Major road infrastructure improvements.</p>	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 9:35AM
David	Groce	3475 Acorn Drop Lane	<p>I am strongly opposed to the proposed development and rezoning of this property. Southwick has become a very busy road as motorists, looking to avoid constant congestion on other parts of the island, use it as a bypass. The intersection of Southwick and Maybank Highway has become extremely difficult to navigate and dangerous. Southwick and the intersection at Maybank, in the short term, cannot handle the incremental volume of large construction and delivery vehicles that development of the property would bring with it. Longer term, neither Southwick nor Maybank are equipped to handle the ongoing new volume that development of the property would bring with it. No development should be allowed on this property until road improvements- on Southwick and on Maybank- have been irrevocably committed to. If development of the property is permitted to proceed with the requisite new infrastructure, there will inevitably be more traffic, more accidents, more personal injury, and more property damage as a result. Moreover, the character of the Maybank Highway corridor will be degraded that much more.</p>	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 10:08AM
Laurel	Williams	3308 Dunwick Dr Johns Island, SC 29455	<p>Please do not rezone! No development needs to be there. It is wetlands. The communities around there already flood. This would increase flooding exponentially. Also there are too many cars on the supporting road now as it is. The infrastructure is not there for this development!</p>	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 11:42AM
Aldwin	Roman	3253 Dunwick Drive	<p>I oppose the rezoning of "Hamlet at Maybank Phase 2" located on Southwick Drive before the City of Charleston Planning Commission. The developer wants to upzone the property to permit 160 townhouse apartments rather than up to 128 single family homes. The developer held a public meeting on November 9th where they heard concerns about traffic and wetlands. They did not address the traffic issues. I believe the rezoning of this property would create more traffic issues in an already problematic area. No mitigating solutions have been offered by the Developer. This will not benefit residents of our community.</p>	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 11:53AM

Sherri	Jacobs	1249 Dogpatch lane	I drive down southwick every day. The area is getting too congested. Accidents all the time on brownswood. Traffic is bad turning on to maybank already. The roads cannot handle it not to mention the increased flooding	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 12:57PM
Alex	Djordjevic	3407 Acorn Drop Ln Johns Island	The traffic in the area is already extremely dangerous, people are putting their lives in danger daily turning onto and off of Southwick to Maybank. There is No Plan to improve the intersection or make Southwick safer. The roads cannot support the population addition to the area. Additionally, the filling and building on wetlands will exacerbate flooding in the area. There are enough apartments on Johns Island and there is no need to change the already approved plans for single family homes.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 2:54PM
Chris	Bigley	1648 Fishbone Drive	The area floods and does not drain. Developer lied when saying community was contacted, why should we believe them now.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 5:33PM

Justin	Follmer	1606 Fishbone Drive	<p>I submitted a letter to the Clerk of Council as well as all 12 members of City Council. This letter is physically signed by close to 100 (92, I believe) community members of Fenwick Woods that oppose the rezoning request for the following reasons: •SR-1 allows for up to 124 residential homes on this land. DR-6 would allow for an additional 32 units to be constructed putting the total at 156 units. 32 more units results in more congestion at the intersections of Southwick Dr & Brownswood Rd, Southwick Dr & Maybank Highway, as well as Brownswood Rd & Killfish Rd. •The intersection of Southwick Dr and Maybank Highway is arguably at capacity during most times of the day as a direct result of the overdevelopment of Johns Island without much needed infrastructure improvement. Adding 32 additional homes would exacerbate this problem and further the dangerous intersection this has become. •32 additional homes would add to the growing problem of speeding through surrounding neighborhoods as a cut-through from Brownswood to Maybank Highway. •This tract of land is one of the last wetland and water mitigation areas within the “Wicks” area of Johns Island. Building an additional 32 homes would ruin parts of this natural habitat and allow flooding to become a larger problem than it currently is. •This tract of land contains bald eagles, owls, hawks, turkey, and other fowl in addition to many deer, fox, and other animals that roam freely throughout this area. Adding an additional 32 homes would ruin this habitat. •Southwick Road does not have shoulders, sidewalks, nor adequate illumination at night. This poses a problem for safety of surrounding communities. Adding an additional 32 homes would exacerbate this problem. •Approving the rezoning for an additional 32 units would place the desires of the developer and future residents ahead of the needs of existing residents who have called this area home for many years. Elected officials should place more emphasis on the needs of existing communities rather than future communities. Rezoning to DR-6 in this case, and rezoning in general, on Johns Island is the crux of the problem Johns Island faces. A few years ago, the island could handle the changes. However, it has become apparent that needed infrastructure has been placed on the back burner and ignored. Our community, and those undersigned, do not support this rezoning proposal, and respectfully request that the City Councilmembers deny it</p>	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 5:43PM
--------	---------	---------------------------	---	---------	--------------------------

Kerrah	Panzardi	Fishbone Dr.	<p>I oppose the rezoning and building of any units at this location. My backyard faces this area which is a wetland. I and many others are concerned about flooding. The area directly behind my property already has a drainage issue that the DOT has been notified about and I'm waiting to be addressed. I'm concerned with additional water issues if this land were to be developed. Again this area is wetland and should be protected. Second the traffic on Southwick is already an issue with people dangerously speeding through and cutting through my neighborhood (Fenwick Woods). Adding these units would escalate the dangers and in addition increase the already horrible traffic situation we have at Maybank/Southwick. We do not have proper infrastructure to keep building in this area. Safety, the wellbeing of current residents, and the preservation of wetlands needs to be prioritized. Allowing these units to be built and wetlands destroyed is wrong. Period.</p>	Opposed	<p>Nov 14 2022 5:53PM</p>
LAURA	Miller	<p>1534 Fishbone Drive. Johns Island</p>	<p>The Southwick Road would not support any type of traffic other than the Single family homes. The intersection at Southwick and Maybank,(the main intersection to get off island can 10 5-7 minutes to make turn during rush hour. It could not support any further traffic, so I disapprove of any change than it's current single family development</p>	Opposed	<p>Nov 14 2022 7:50PM</p>

Patrick	O'Connor	3414 Dunwick Dr	<p>We looked at the existing zoning and plans for the area prior to purchasing our home which went into contract in 2017. This area was single family homes. To proceed with this project allows for a company touting a long term hold approach to do whatever it is in their best interest not the interest of the home owners already here. The bait and switch of single family homes under one deed which is nothing more than another apartment complex should shock the commission. What will happen is this developer will hold the property for a period of time. When repairs and major maintenance begin to grow which will happen within a decade they will sell it and what happens in all aged multi family developments will happen here. There are already too many of these style development approved and it needs to stop. How would anyone on planning commission feel if this was being proposed in their neighborhood? Speed concerns are a reality. Southwick is already dangerous on both ends. It will become more dangerous in each end and very dangerous in between. I asked about traffic. Was told there is another egress that will be used on maybank and it connects both of our properties. It's more likely the bulk of traffic from both properties will use southwick. When asked why not leave the zoning alone and let a builder do what's zoned. Personal pride in ownership etc and they can use the road to exit to maybank. The response was no we don't want that traffic on our road. When asked about the current condition of southwick and how to improve it to handle any change the answer was it's a state road not our problem to surmise. I strongly oppose this project and zoning change</p>	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 8:18PM
---------	----------	--------------------	---	---------	--------------------------

LuAnne	OConnor	3414 Dunwick Drive, Johns Island	<p>I am strongly opposed to the rezoning request for the property located on Southwick Drive. When we purchased our home, we were attracted to the fact that this neighborhood was zoned single-family and was so welcoming. This is a neighborhood of homeowners that take pride in their homes and watch out for their neighbors. I have several concerns on the proposed development of rental townhomes. 1) I am concerned that this type of property will have a negative impact on home values in our neighborhood, especially if the property is not kept in good condition in the future. If the developers decide to sell the property in the future, and I imagine that as with any home that maintenance costs will be necessary, how can our neighborhood be assured that the current or future owners will upkeep the properties? If maintenance is not kept up to par, then the properties could become run-down and riddled with crime, which definitely affects property values and quality of life. 2) Currently Southwick Drive is already burdened with heavy traffic, as many people use this road as a cut-through between Brownswood Road and Maybank Hwy. Recently a new commercial strip center opened on Maybank Hwy directly across the intersection of Maybank Hwy & Southwick Dr; making this intersection that was already difficult to exit from Southwick downright dangerous. There is no traffic light at this intersection. 3) My husband and I attended the community meeting with the developers, and I was quite appalled at their nonchalant attitude. We questioned them about their plans to address how the renters of their property would affect the traffic situation on Southwick Drive and their response was that Southwick was a state road and not their problem. In fact, they spoke as if we should be thrilled at the beautiful townhomes that they would build and reiterated several times that they did not plan to build on the wetlands. I may just be naïve on this point, but I always understood that it is difficult for developers to build on wetlands. Regardless, I found their attitude quite insulting and the point of view that I received from that meeting was that the developers could care less about our neighborhood and plan to do whatever they can to accomplish their goals. I am respectfully requesting that the members of the Planning Commission consider our wonderful neighborhood and deny the request to rezone this property.</p>	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 9:03PM
Cara	Johnson	3376 Dunwick Drive	<p>The intersection of Southwick and Maybank is already horribly dangerous to try to turn left out of. The addition of the double turn lane on Maybank when the shopping center across the street made things so much worse. Until there is a roundabout (ideally) or stoplight at that intersection, there should be absolutely no discussion about adding hundreds of additional cars to Southwick that will need to turn left out of that intersection every single day. Please have some integrity for once and help the people who already live here rather than making all your decisions for the sake of making as much money as possible.</p>	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 10:05PM

Peter	Rubino, P.E.	3009 Tugalo St., Johns Island, SC	<p>I believe that the up zoning of the subject property will be a detriment to the surrounding neighborhoods and overwhelm the inadequate existing roads available in the area. The nature of the development will result in transient population who have no pride of ownership or sense of belonging to the Johns Island ethnos, family and culture. The rental properties could result in more tenants than just families, where single occupants could share the rent thus potentially increase the number of vehicles added to the mix traffic. Rather than 320 cars from the 160 units, you could have as many as 400 added cars to the traffic patterns in the area. Will there be sufficient parking planned for in the development to handle this volume? What are the design standards for rental properties? Is it 1.5 parking spaces per unit? This is not be adequate if multiple tenants are living in each unit. Where will these cars be parked? Also, how will this development impact the existing neighborhoods. Think of the homeowners across the street from the development, who now look out their windows and there is a forest of trees across the street. After the development, they will look out to see a wall of 2 story townhouses looking back at them. One final point, are you asking for impervious surfaces to be incorporated in this development if it moves forward. This might be the only way to ensure there is no downstream flooding created by this development. To me this sounds like a problem just waiting to happen. The additional traffic alone should give you more than second thoughts about this development.</p>	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 10:48PM
Tre	Saun	Stanwick Drive	<p>No! Focus on fixing traffic concerns. Bettering our schools. We want to continue to be a community! STOP building. Please. Not everything is about money! Leave some homes for wildlife & let us keep our oxygen. NOOOOO we don't want it any town homes here. You are also going to FLOOD us out. We don't want anymore building over here!</p>	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 12:00AM
Kai	Smiley	Dunwick	<p>Please don't approve this. Traffic on Johns Island is dangerous already! Coming out of Southwick onto Maybank is HIGHLY dangerous. Please realize that car insurance premiums are going up because of ALL the accidents that happen on Johns Island now. Lives are being lost. Adding more cars will only make it worse. The build will be on wetland. The flooding is ALREADY bad in the area. They even attempted to make the ditches deeper but that only lasted for several months. This development is not safe. I strongly oppose.</p>	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 12:08AM

Janet	Boggs	2958 Sweetleaf Lane Johns Island SC 29455	Too many apartments, townhouses, single family home already. Flooding, traffic, current roads cannot support this with no widening.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 8:01AM
Michael	Andolena	1448 Milldam Pass, Johns Island, SC 29455	In the strongest possible terms, my family and I are opposed to the rezoning of land on Southwick Drive. Johns Island has experienced an incredible amount of growth in population and development over the past five years. As a result, our roads have become horribly congested, our wildlife endangered, and our environment permanently altered. While I support capitalism and growth on our island, I oppose the unnecessary and uncontrolled growth of additional housing units on the island until sufficient improvements have been made to roadways & infrastructure, as well as sufficient ecological surveys have been conducted to ensure that wildlife and marshland are protected. The City of Charleston's failure to adequately consider and plan for the growth on Johns Island has caused flooding, roadway congestion, and ecological damage. We cannot tolerate additional, unfettered, uncoordinated, underfunded, and unplanned development on Johns Island. With that, we are strongly opposed to the application to rezone the land on Southwick Drive.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 8:06AM
Angela	Calhoun	2518 General Hatch Dr	Please halt development on Johns Island! The roads & infrastructure cannot support existing home & absolutely cannot handle more development. Please put appropriate much needed infrastructure in place first. Roads are dangerous, narrow, can't accommodate current traffic patterns. Too many car accidents & fatalities. Thank you	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 6:25AM

Esta	Musarra	1629 Southwick Drive	<p>Since moving to Johns Island eight years ago, we are struck with the number of areas that are clear-cut for development and currently under construction. Progress is inevitable, but it needs to take on a holistic approach, not parcel by parcel.</p> <p>The latest rezoning application has individuals, as well as, the Johns Island Council, very concerned. The rezoning of 62 acres on Southwick Drive requests that it be changed from single family to diverse residential. The negative impact with rezoning this land would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ignore the recommendations from the Dutch Dialogues when planning to develop wetland areas. This property has extensive wetlands on it. The result of filling in these wetlands will cause flooding in neighboring areas and have a negative impact on the wildlife. The city has had to correct their mistakes for not following the Dutch Dialogue recommendations in the past, at a tremendous expense, due to filling in wetlands. • Infrastructure should be in place first. The roads on and off of Johns Island cannot handle the current traffic, let alone the traffic that will result when the current construction projects are completed. The intersections of Southwick Drive and Maybank Highway, River Road and Maybank Highway, along with Main Road and Savannah Highway are a nightmare and very dangerous. More residents per acre will amplify these existing problems. <p>With the use of the knowledge obtained from the Dutch Dialogues and to ensure the people on Johns Island have the quality of life that all Charlestonians deserve, I am confident you will not allow this rezoning to be approved. Thank you for your time.</p>	Opposed	Email Nov 1 2022 9:45AM
Fenwick Woods Homeowner's		Fenwick Woods	See attached letter	Opposed	Letter Nov 5
Sean	Heuston	Johns Island	Adding new residential units on Johns Island near the Gelegotis Bridge would exacerbate an already-bad traffic flow problem and would contribute to the ongoing destruction of wetlands.	Opposed	Nov 13 2022 12:51PM

Rachel	Mattox	1623 Southwick Drive	We live directly across from the proposed rezoning and development and strongly oppose this proposal. Southwick Drive has a bad history of speeding and accidents in the stretch between the two corners on opposite sides of Traywick, where the development proposes to put an exit onto Southwick, which is dangerous and unacceptable. Lieutenant Krasowski with Charleston Police Department has done studies using All Traffic Solutions in past months proving this area has many speeders. He also stated it needs to be reengineered per his assessment to solve continuing traffic issues. This same intersection is under several inches of water every time there is a few inches of rain. For these reasons, Southwick Drive, especially that area, would be a terrible place to add more cars and increase congestion. This roadway is not currently functioning well and more development will only increase flooding. This fragile ecosystem cannot withstand more building making existing poor drainage even less effective. Further, we do not want to view townhomes where trees are now. The City of Charleston is entrusted with considering existing taxpaying residents and fragile ecosystems. These needs should be considered before developers and proposals. Citizens do not want more congestion nor development in this area. This proposal would damage Johns Island ecologically and socially. Given the well documented problems by CPD in this area, approval of this proposal would be dangerous and irresponsible.	Opposed	Nov 11 2022 11:29AM
Sherri	Benson	614 Two Mile Run, Johns Island Sc 29455	Wetlands will be disturbed and more traffic is not in our island heat interest before better infrastructure is established. That needs to be our islands 1st priority. Get it together and take a stand for our island	Opposed	Nov 7 2022 3:47PM
Michael	Curtis	1229 Updyke Drive	I can add to the flooding and congestion issues already faced near Maybank. Also, until 526 extension is in place the safety of people leaving for major storms is reduced.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 10:20AM
Amy	Harman	3235 Arrow Arum Dr, Johns Island, SC 29455	100% against the rezoning of Fenwick Hills. Current infrastructure cannot support additional traffic, which will lead to increased congestion and vehicular accidents. Additionally, development will remove a natural habitat for much wildlife, including red tail hawks, coopers hawks, Mississippi kites, and bald eagles. Removal of natural wetlands will increase flooding in our area.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 11:58AM

Hannah	Giddens	1774 Southwick Dr, Johns Island SC 29455	I am opposed to the rezoning of the following: 1. Property on Southwick Dr Fenwick Hills - Johns Island TMS # 2790000018 Approx. 60.61 ac. I had typed extensive comments on the public submission page but it was broken and rejected submission. I will appear in person tomorrow.	Opposed	Email Nov 15 2022 11:00 AM
Will	Greene	1 Percy Street	I am in opposition to the proposed up-zoning of the midtown development. As a local resident and active participant in our neighborhood, I have worked with a large group of neighbors over the years. We have tried to keep the balance of STR and residential homes. Many purchase homes thinking the way around the zoning is to request an rezoning. There are many properties available for purchase where an investor can purchase for STR use. Seeking rezoning just the increase property value is not appropriate here. Approving this request would cause an onslaught of similar requests leaving our neighborhood at risk of losing the balance we have all worked so hard to achieve.	Opposed	Email Nov 15 2022 11:08 AM

**City of Charleston Planning Commission
November 16, 2022 Meeting**

**Public Comment for Planned Unit Development #2:
Brewster Ct, Cannon St, Coming St & Saint Philip St**

Cannonborough - Elliotborough - Peninsula | Approx. 1.39 ac.

TMS # 4600804015, 016, 017, 037, 042, 043, 075 through 081, 083 through 088, 090 & 094 through 110

Request amendment to the Residences at Coming & Cannon Street Planned Unit Development (PUD) Master Plan and Development guidelines to change the permitted uses to allow commercial short-term rentals for all properties within the PUD.

Owner: Ty Costa et al. | Applicant: Virginia Landon

6 Comments Submitted in Support | 40 Comments Submitted in Opposition

First Name	Last Name	Address	Submitted Comment	Support/ Opposed	Date/Time Submitted
Comments Submitted in Support: 6					
Jonathan	Daniels	26 Cannon Street Apt A, Charleston SC 29403	To whom it may concern, I am the owner of 26 Cannon Street Apt A and on the board to Midtown Community Association. I have spoken with several owners within the association as well as with the board. We are in full support for the proposed PUD amendment to allow short-term rentals. Our neighborhood is in the city short-term rental overlay, and we would love to have the same opportunity for our owners within the Midtown Community Association. This amendment will protect our property values and assist in keeping properties in good order and repair. Thank you for your time and consideration in this amendment.	Support	Nov 14 2022 1:33PM
Sam	Rhodes	8 Brewster Court Charleston S.C. 29482	As a homeowner of 8 Brewster Court located in the Midtown Community, I am in full support of amending the PUD Zoning to allow for short term rentals. Our neighborhood is located within the Cannonborough neighborhood which is a carveout zone in the City of Charleston that allows short term rentals. Our Homes located in our neighborhood also have two dedicated parking spaces per home to accommodate renters and have less impact on neighboring homes. To deny us the ability to rent our homes short term like our neighbors are permitted would be unfair. The majority of homeowners in our community support this change of zoning. Please approve this change and thank you for the consideration.	Support	Nov 14 2022 11:18AM

Jill	Garnot	14 Brewster Court Charleston SC 29403	As a full-time homeowner and HOA Board Member (current President) for the Midtown Community, I am in full support of amending the PUD Zoning to allow for short term rentals. I feel that each homeowner should have the choice to live in their residence full-time, rent it as a long-term rental or rent it as a short-term rental. Our homes are within the Cannonborough Elliotborough neighborhood which is a carveout and allowable zone for short-term rentals. We now desire to be allowed to as well and have had a majority of homeowners vote in favor. We appreciate the City of Charleston's consideration and approval.	Support	Nov 14 2022 10:29AM
Cameron	Whitten	210 Coming St, Charleston SC 29403	I support the application and request the Commission to approve. Not only would the property owners gain value but the entire neighborhood would benefit. Lodging options would be created, jobs would be created.	Support	Nov 14 2022 1:49PM
Brett	Carron	443 Huger St. 29403	As a local small business owner in the neighborhood (Indigo & Cotton, 79 Cannon St.) I support the proposed amendment. Tourism makes up the largest part of our customer base and I feel giving additional property owners the option to offer STR's would be a great benefit to us and the neighborhood.	Support	Nov 15 2022 8:04AM
Walter	Howard	216 Coming St 29403	I support the application.	Support	Nov 15 2022 9:58AM
Comments Submitted in Opposition: 40					
Stephen	Ramos	48 Bogard Street	As a resident of the Cannonborough-Elliotborough Neighborhood, I strongly oppose this application. The neighborhood has a comfortable balance of residents and short-term rental units. A majority of the commercially zoned properties in the neighborhood have been converted to short-term rental units. Therefore, if this application is approved, it is only a matter of time before all 28 buildings in this PUD are converted to STR. That is a significant loss in residential units and it sets a dangerous precedent. The city has consistently upheld the STR ordinance and I ask that you continue this diligence. Thank you.	Opposed	Nov 13 2022 2:09PM

Tara	Lowry	6 Bee st	I am vehemently opposed to this project. The goal of short term rentals is for people to experience Charleston in a humble way. Projects like these and multi property conglomerates are resorts and hotels. They have multiple shared common spaces which is against the guidelines of short term rentals in Charleston. These hotels are causing havoc to the neighborhoods and the residents. They bring mass amounts of people and partying that are detrimental even to local businesses. These conglomerates are wreaking havoc on the livability of downtown. Short term rentals are truly best when they are an owner occupied multi family properties that are one property not multiple properties together. These kinds of large developments, which this what it is, a large development that have multi apartments and short term rentals only affect the live ability of people downtown from noise, trash, business opportunities for owner occupied short term rentals, and cleanliness of the city.	Opposed	Nov 13 2022 4:58PM
Jack	Heaton	56 Warren Street	I feel it is inappropriate to consider actions that would remove a large swath of residences from the housing stock and turning them over to tourism.	Opposed	Nov 13 2022 7:06PM
Nancy	Wilson	Rutledge Avenue, Charleston, 29403	I am absolutely opposed to this upzoning to allow for STRs. It is vital to the health of our city that we preserve every bit of the available long-term housing stock to provide for the number of people who want to live and work downtown. We also need long-term residents to ensure that our downtown communities continue to thrive. When considering the already existing STRs and the many hotels around the city, it is completely unnecessary to add additional STRs in the place of LTRs. This is a clear money-grab by the developers and not at all in the best interest of the city or its residents.	Opposed	Nov 13 2022 10:50PM
Cator	Sparks	118 Spring St	We need a diverse neighborhood and do not want the entire neighborhood to be STR! We need more permanent and long term residence. We are loosing the connection and canvas of an actual neighborhood as it's turning more and more into a bachelor and bachelorette party house destination which is ruining the character of the area.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 8:49AM
Sandra	Fowler	9 Simonton Mews Charleston, 29403	We need to maintain residential housing stock in this area, which is already overrun with short term rentals, to maintain a diverse and vibrant community. Such a concentration of short term rentals rips the heart out of a neighborhood, and I strongly urge the Commission to oppose this upzoning.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 9:20AM

Stevenson	Bennett	97 Rutledge Avenue	I own 65 Cannon Street and some other buildings in the neighborhood. The original PUD was intended to provide a mix of uses including residential and the commercial corners at Cannon and St Philip and Cannon and Coming. Maintaining that mix is critical to the vitality of the neighborhood. I am OPPOSED.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 9:40AM
Carol	Frances	242 Ashley Avenue	To allow up zoning for these 31 houses would be a tragedy for the Cannonborough-Elliottborough neighborhood! Although there are many STRs here already it is still an intact neighborhood with real people and real families who make Charleston home. Allowing this development to be all STRs is surely the way to eradicate actual neighborhoods. Charleston must remain a living and breathing community WITH tourists not solely OF tourists. PLEASE PLEASE do not let this happen, we beg you!	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 9:52AM
Katherine	Libby	237 Ashley Avenue	We do not want the entire neighborhood to be all STRs. If this request is granted a dangerous precedent would be established and will result in other properties seeking to up-zone.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 9:59AM
Elizabeth	Soule	58 Warren Street, Charleston	I oppose the loss of rental units via the conversion to Short Term Rentals (STRs). People who rent for a weekend are not part of the fabric of the community. Long-term residents create a vibrant neighborhood, whereas STRs do not facilitate residents who are engaged in working on problem solving and the like. In order to address issues in the neighborhoods and continue to make Cannonborough-Elliottborough a place where people want to live, we must curtail further conversions of housing units to STRs. Additionally, given we have a number of new hotels already approved, expansion of STRs diminishes their customer base and therefore their ultimate viability.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 10:44AM
Patty	Harrison	4521 w sterling ranch rd	I strongly oppose the upzone request for the residences in the above area from residential to commercial. I appreciate the diversity in the Cannonborough and Elliottborough communities	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 12:36PM
Patrick	Pernell	12 Leo Lane (213 Ashley Ave HPR)	As a long-term resident (1984) of Cannonborough-Elliottborough I am strongly opposed to the up-zoning of Brewster Court which would allow for commercial use including STRs. This up-zoning would be a detriment to the neighborhood and an infringement on the quality of life to me and my neighbors. I urge the Planning Commission to deny this re-zoning application. Sincerely, Patrick Pernell 12 Leo lane	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 12:43PM
Barclay	Murphy	12 Bee Street	Allowing the conversion of 31 homes to short term rentals would have a devastating effect on our neighborhood. This would create a hotel in the neighborhood where we live and work. Do not approve this zoning change!	Opposed	Nov 13 2022 5:25PM

Lee	Trent	517 Royall Ave, Mt Pleasant, SC	I have lived or owned in the Cannonborough for twelve years. The neighborhood needs a diversity of commercial and residential uses, not 100% STRs. Not to mention that this takes a lot of housing stock off the market. For these reasons, I oppose the request to upzone Brewster Court.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 2:37PM
Jason	Coy	31 Bogard Street, Charleston, SC 29403	I am writing to urge the City of Charleston Planning Commission to reject the request to up-zone the 31 residences at Brewster Court, Cannon Street, Coming Street, and St Philip Street from residential to commercial. The sole purpose of this zoning request is to facilitate their conversion to STRs, which would drastically and negatively impact livability in the Cannonborough-Elliotborough neighborhood, where I am a homeowner, and the city at large. If allowed, this massive increase in the number of STRs in our neighborhood would bring substantial parking, trash, and noise issues, and it would take essential residential housing off the market. All of these issues would negatively affect livability in the neighborhood, upsetting the delicate balance between housing and businesses in our neighborhood and in the city. It would also take housing off the market, driving up prices for long-term residents and exacerbating the shortage of affordable housing. I am a member of CENA, and we have long opposed these sorts of up-zones for the reasons above, and the city has generally supported the desires of long-term residents to preserve the quality of their neighborhood. If this request is granted, it would threaten to establish a dangerous precedent that would no doubt lead to even more STRs appearing in the area and the city. Thank you for your consideration.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 3:16PM
Sylvia	Szentpetery	56 Warren St.	Changing a residentially zoned community to a 90-bed short term rental hub is unacceptable. This would be worse than changing the area to a hotel where at least there would be staff, security, maintenance, etc. Short term rentals welcome noise, trash, lack of consideration for the beautiful and historic neighborhood and city we live in and should be maintained in limited numbers, not added in entire communities. What makes downtown Charleston attractive is not it's short term rental units, it is the actual homes of residents and businesses.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 3:33PM
James	Ravenel	361 Ashley Ave, Charleston, SC	Opposed to the application for 31 house STR permits.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 7:03PM
Ron	Nixon	106 Spring St	This would set a horrible precedent and create even more STRs in an area that has already been over run with them due to poor city planning to start with. More over, it's simply just a money grab by this property owner and agent.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 8:46PM

Deborah	Larson	25 Sires	I am opposed to any up zoning which might set a precedent for future requests. A mix of STRs, single family, multi family living currently exists in the neighborhood. Living in the mix has demonstrated that vacationers do not have the same hours, noise tolerance, and trash awareness as residents. Tipping the balance in favor of STRs will promote decline in the quality and livability of the existing neighborhood.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 8:58PM
Laurie	Hicks	136 Spring St	Please deny this request to re-zone almost an entire block. Cannonborough Elliottborough consists of a nice balance of full time residents, long term renters, short term renters and commercial businesses including restaurants. We don't need a blanket re-zoning converting this to basically a hotel and establishing a harmful precedent.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 9:00PM
James	Hicks	37 Cannon	Please deny this zoning change. If these people do not like the allowed use of their property, WHY did they buy it. If they want to get into the STR business, they can buy a property that is zoned STR. We do not want a de facto hotel in the middle fo our neighborhood. Please deny this immediately. Thank you	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 9:12PM
Davis	Vergnolle	17 Sires St.	I oppose the amendment request for the Residences at Coming & Canonon Street PUD to become a commercial property. This will threaten the sense of community and comradery in the neighborhood.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 9:43PM
Rick	Harden	242 Ashley Avenue	I am strongly against this amendment, believing that the health of the neighborhood requires a balance of owner residents, long-term renters and short term rentals. The up-zoning request, should it be granted, will further turn Cannonborough-Elliottborough, into essentially a "hotel" district by the loss of 31 more long-term residences (residents). Granting this application will open the flood gate to many more opportunistic investors seeking up zoning with no regard for the quality of life in our neighborhood. I urge you to deny this outrageous request.	Opposed	Nov 14 2022 11:31PM
Phillip	Rhodes	28 Warren St.	Enough! Please reject this proposal. The city north of Calhoun is becoming increasingly hostile to actual residents. The King St. conversion that funnels traffic into our neighborhoods... the seemingly endless number of ugly mixed-use midrises... the crime... the lack of parking enforcement... the lack of funding for the city's arbor department that results in sad, barren streets like St. Philip... the lack of funding for even basic services like garbage cans (Radcliffeborough has to buy their own!). And now, someone wants to turn half of an entire block of Cannonborough/Elliottborough into a giant AirBnB hotel for even more transient visitors? No thanks!	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 8:29AM

Brad	Harvey	12 Bee Street, Apt. G	The upzoning of this parcel will negatively impact the livability of the Cannonborough/Elliotborough neighborhoods.	Opposed	Email
DANIEL	ATWILL	238 St Philip St.	By changing this block to STR could single-handedly change the culture of the neighborhood. This also creates a precedent for surrounding PUD's to be allowed to do the same. It is important to have a balance in the neighborhood of residential, commercial/STR, which Cannonborough/Elliotborough has been able to achieve. Passing this application would lead us to the tipping point. Such a high concentration also potentially creates an environment not conducive for full time residents.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 8:58AM
Mary Mac	Wilson	217 Ashley Avenue	An up-zoning of this scale in the STR overlay would completely change the fabric of Cannonborough-Elliotborough. This is a neighborhood, not a resort.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 9:11AM
Elaine and Ray	Mueller	69 Morris St. Unit #301 Charleston, S.C. 29403	Opposed to the up zoning because it would (1) remove vital housing stock from our neighborhood (2) permanent residents are needed to maintain a thriving neighborhood; (3) would contribute to increased congestion and crime on King St. on the weekends which is already a serious issue; (4) do not want the entire neighborhood to be short term rentals...takes away from the "neighborhood" feeling.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 10:03AM
Seantell	Dorsey	149 Line St, Charleston, SC 29403	I am strongly OPPOSED to the upzoning of these properties from residential to commercial in order to allow more short term rentals. This would remove housing from our neighborhood and potentially lead to an increase in issues that occur in our neighborhood (I.e excessive noise, trash/littering, less affordable housing, etc). I do not feel that we need to have a neighborhood full of short term rental units.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 10:10AM

Jeff	Worrall	51 Cannon St	I'm an owner/resident on Cannon St. in Cannonborough/Elliotborough and have lived here for 10 years and I oppose PUD amendment 2 which would allow commercial STR to the properties on Brewster Ct/Cannon St/Coming St/Saint Philip St. The neighborhood is already too heavily weighted to short term rentals over full time residents or long term renters, especially with all the recent development and additions to properties in the neighborhood over the past few years. Up-zoning these properties would negatively impact the neighborhood environment and balance of occupants by adding a significant amount of inventory to the short term rental market shifting further away from the full time/long term residents that currently occupy the units. We do not want to neighborhood that is only STR's. Adding such a large inventory of STR-zoned properties also creates risk to the neighborhood long term if the demand of STR-type rentals ever shrinks. Quality of life, property value, and neighborhood identity will be negatively impacted if this change in zoning is allowed. Please DO NOT approve this amendment.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 10:21AM
Sally	Eisenberg	12 catfiddle st	Oppose the up zone to short term rental	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 10:45AM
Jacquelin	Bennett	51 South Battery	We strongly oppose this request. We have owned property on St Philip St for 30 years and have watched it turn into one short term rental after another. Ordinary people cannot afford to live here as they used to. The area is losing its homey feeling and people who used to live here cannot afford it. We don't want to see this be only a hotel district.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 10:57AM
Ron	Reiff	Coming Street	My family has lived in the Cannonborough-Elliotborough neighborhood for many years. We support the PUD amendment application and encourage the Planning Commission to approve. It will be beneficial to the neighborhood by assisting the owners to keep properties in good order and repair, which benefits everyone by maintaining property values. The neighborhood will continue to have its mix of residential and commercial uses with its current character and quality of life as overseen by the Midtown Community Association.	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 11:49AM

<p>Lisa</p>	<p>Maloney</p>	<p>239 St. Philip St. Charleston</p>	<p>November 15, 2022 To: City of Charleston Planning Commission Re: Zoning Change in development located at Brewster Ct, Cannon St, Coming St, and St. Philip St. To whom it may concern: I am a 25 year resident of 237/239 St. Philip St. and we have seen this neighborhood change pretty dramatically over the years. Some changes have been great, others not so much. As someone who lives in a part of Elliotborough where the zoning allows for whole house short term rentals, we have gone from a vibrant street that had college students, families with young kids, and other long term residents to a nearly totally transient population. It's changed the fabric of what a neighborhood is supposed to be. Nearly every weekend we are subjected to additional noise, litter, and cars parked in our yard. I was verbally assaulted a few weeks ago when I asked an STR tenant to move his car out of my driveway. The only short term answer we know is to call the police and to TRY to get Livability involved to hold property owners responsible, though this avenue has only proven to be moderately successful at best. We know all of this as 25 year residents, but the long term answer to our neighborhood turning into one giant hotel complex is to stop allowing property owners to seek a zoning change. The reason they seek the change is simple, it's economics. They paid more for the property that they can recoup through a long term rental. It has way over-inflated property values here and kept out the types of buyers who would contribute to this neighborhood i.e. families, young professionals, retirees. While I may live a couple of blocks away from this development, I feel very strongly that a zoning change is going to further downgrade the quality of life in Elliotborough. The property owners are asking for the zoning change strictly as a financial matter. Our wonderful neighborhood deserves so much more than that. You would be setting a very dangerous precedent. What would stop everyone else in this area from seeking a zoning change with the very valid argument that the city has allowed the zoning change on other properties close by? We can and must do better for this neighborhood and it's long term residents. As a RESIDENT, I am opposed and offended by this request and I ask that it not be considered for approval. Sincerely, LisaMaloney 237/239 St. Philip St.</p>	<p>Opposed</p>	<p>Nov 15 2022 11:28AM</p>
-------------	----------------	--	---	----------------	------------------------------------

Leah	Worthington	31 Bogard Street	<p>As a resident of this neighborhood, I STRONGLY OPPOSE this application. THIS REQUEST IS THE EQUIVALENT OF A MOTEL BEING ADDED TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD. We need housing! Not another place to pack in tourists. Cannonborough-Elliottborough has worked so hard to maintain a BALANCE of commercial and residential properties. This balance goes out the window if this massive up-zoning were to be approved. Granting an up-zoning would replace existing housing--that we need!--with A LARGE HORRIBLE PILE OF BACHELORETTE PARTY PADS. The density of STRs would be horrific. Our quality of life in this neighborhood would tank. We LIKE a mix in our neighborhood. Diversity is key! BUT we do not want a whole neighborhood of STRs. As a neighborhood, we have CONSISTENTLY OPPOSED UP-ZONES to keep our neighborhood diverse and TO ENSURE THERE IS HOUSING FOR PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY WANT TO LIVE HERE. Permanent residents, long term renters, retail, service businesses, restaurants, etc. are needed to ensure a vibrant and thriving neighborhood. Not just tourists. If this request is granted a dangerous precedent would be established and will result in other properties seeking to up-zoning. IF THIS UP-ZONING WERE GRANTED, IT WOULD BE THE BEGINNING OF THE END FOR Cannonborough-Elliottborough. Please don't let that happen. Thank you.</p>	Opposed	<p>Nov 15 2022 11:22AM</p>
------	-------------	------------------	--	---------	------------------------------------

Chuck	Waring	205 Saint Philip Street	<p>We have owned 205 Saint Philip Street since 2017 (our property is 2 doors down from Brewster Court). Since purchasing our property as a commercially zoned property, we have invested a lot of time, energy and money to renovate and improve this property. And I think, most would agree we have made a positive improvement to the Cannonborough/Elliotborough (CE) neighborhood. Turning what was a college rental (when we purchased the property) into a beautifully restored and improved property. We did not purchase to up-zone this property but purchased the property for uses, as it was previously zoned. We now have a beautiful short term rental property. Before it was an eyesore and a liveability issue due to large parties thrown by college students.</p> <p>Since 2017, we have enjoyed the mix of properties in the Cannonborough/Elliotborough neighborhood. The mix of properties from short-term rental, long term rentals, primary dwellings, bed & breakfasts, restaurants, student housing and other retail space. The diverse mix of properties has made the CE neighborhood very enjoyable and a great Charleston neighborhood !!!</p> <p>The up-zone of the property at Brewster Court from its intended use of residential housing to commercial uses would not improve the CE neighborhood. It would usher in more short term rentals and would negatively tip the scales of an otherwise great Charleston neighborhood. It would eliminate a very much needed stock of primary dwellings and long term rental properties. I would encourage you to vote "NO" for the request to up-zone this property.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Opposed	<p>Email Nov 15 2022 11:57 AM</p>
Rebecca	Blackman Ramsay		<p>Maintaining residential properties is vital to our neighborhood. Allowing a rezone of this size would be detrimental to the neighborhood and set a bad precedent moving forward. Please do not allow this development to be converted.</p>	Opposed	<p>Email Nov 15 2022 11:51 AM</p>
Reid	Burgess	264 Ashley Avenue	<p>This would set a terribly negative precedent for other PUD developments in the neighborhood, and in the city. I created a 24-unit PUD nearby (Catfiddle Street) and the thought that this could potentially become a precedent for Catfiddle Street terrifies me.</p>	Opposed	<p>Email Nov 15 2022 11:41 AM</p>

Tara	Hock	76 Warren Street	<p>I am very much opposed to the up-zoning request for the residences at Brewster Court, Cannon St, Coming St, and St. Philip St. That a realtor and a property owner are the ones requesting this change is frustrating. None of the residences in this area were zoned for STRs when any of the owners purchased them, but now a property owner and his or her realtor want to change the zoning so that they can sell the property more easily and at a higher price point?? It sounds like this property owner wants to change the zoning and then leave the area. He or she will not be affected by the change in zoning in any way, but the rest of us will suffer. Approving this request will set a terrible precedent by encouraging other property owners to request the same as well as giving new buyers the idea that they can just request a change to their zone. If this request is approved, all thirty-one houses would become short term rentals and create over 90 bedrooms in one development. Our neighborhood can not support so many new STRs.</p> <p>Cannonborough-Elliottborough has a balance of commercial and residential properties including permanent residents, long term renters, retail, and restaurants, all of which are needed to ensure a vibrant and thriving neighborhood. Allowing these properties to become STRs would remove vital housing stock from our neighborhood.</p> <p>The STR overlay was established in 2018 after a long, involved process during which citizens were able to have input into how STRs would operate on the peninsula and the surrounding areas. It is exhausting and beyond frustrating to have to keep fighting this same battle. We established the STR rules and regulations in 2018 for a reason; let's stick to the.</p>	Opposed	<p>Email Nov 15 2022 11:30 AM</p>
C.A.	Maloney	237/239 St. Philip Street	See attached letter	Opposed	<p>Letter Nov 15 2022</p>

November 15, 2022

To: City of Charleston, Planning Commission

Re: Zoning Change Request: Mid-town development located at Brewster Ct, Cannon St, Coming St, and St. Philip St.

To whom it may concern:

I respectfully request the following statement be read at the hearing and be entered into the public record.

I currently reside at 237/239 St. Philip and have done so for 25 years. I was a 10 year member of the Cannonborough-Elliottborough Neighborhood Association's Executive Committee and was on the steering committee when the City first proposed Short Term Rental use to us, before it's approval in 2012.

While I believe that the requirement for Short Term Rentals at commercially zoned properties only was largely a sound decision for the neighborhood, I believe we erred in not requiring owner occupied residency. We did not have the foresight to know that every property in the overlay that could be an STR would become an STR. That was never our intention. Cannonborough-Elliottborough is over-run with Short Term Rentals now that essentially operate as mini-hotels with no permanent and/or local residents.

My wife and I, and a couple across the street, are the only local homeowner/residents from Spring to Line St. on Saint Philip Street currently. Nearly every privately owned residence within these two blocks is now an STR (or multiple unit STR 'complex').

We have a transient weekend population. Early-mid week it's a residential ghost town. There are no kids, no 'next door' neighbors, and no longer a sense of community. "Quality of life" issues are an ongoing battle (noise, trash, parking). These are exacerbated (or enabled by the City) with incredibly lax Parking and Livability enforcement. Couple this with late night patrons from King Street and it's a nightmare, especially on Friday and Saturday nights.

There should be no exceptions for 'up-zoning' residentially designated properties to be used for Short Term Rental use. Downtown Charleston needs more housing stock for those that live and work here. Mid-Town, as originally proposed and built, is a great example of a project that increased density for residential use and contributed to the demand for downtown living spaces.

As a RESIDENT, I am opposed and offended by this request and I ask that it not be considered for approval.

Sincerely.

C.A. Maloney
237/239 St. Philip Street

**City of Charleston Planning Commission
November 16, 2022 Meeting**

Public Comment for Ordinance Amendment #1:

To amend section 54-306 (Old City Height Districts) of Part 2 (Old City Height Districts and View Corridor Protection) of Article 3 (Site Regulations) and Section 54-506 (Exceptions to Setback Requirements) of Article 5 (Exceptions and Modifications) of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Charleston to increase permitted heights of accessory structures.

No Comments Submitted in Support | 1 Comment Submitted in Opposition

First Name	Last Name	Address	Submitted Comment	Support/ Opposed	Date/Time Submitted
------------	-----------	---------	-------------------	---------------------	------------------------

No Comments Submitted in Support

Comments Submitted in Opposition: 1

Anthony	Bryant	2123 Courtland Avenue Charleston South Carolina 29403	City of Charleston Council since 1924 giving more power to the Planning Commission than City Council for close to 100 years has undermined the one man one vote criteria of the Department of Justice redistricting Plan with the Supreme Court of the United States ruling Euclid v Ambler Realty Company coupled with the fact that local land use policies to amend section 54-306- Old Height District would validate this bias adding additional cost similar to the Preservation Ordinances coupled with Federal Housing Act of 1934 federal redlining undermining by default any efforts to mitigate land use bias as a result of the Judicial and Executive Branch errors leaving the City of Charleston Council with three African American representative to have made public comment to City Council on Redistricting under 2020 Census data and input on 2023 Budget and to have council in violation of Robert Rules by having a discussion of public comments led by the Chairman of the City Council having person deemed in violation of Robert Rules of Order by interrupting speakers not to get more information regarding safety, comfort concerns, exposing those commenters to political reprisal for three of the Council members that requested a change in public comment rules and methods of receiving public comments in which the online method to receive public comment was as a result of and Emergency Measure by Congress as a result of the COVID 19 and the receipt of CARES ACT and ARPA funding that did not have public comment regarding the criteria and method of use without any means testing and measurable outcomes under normal means of Administration and Enforcement of Federal and State Law . sorry for any misspelled words and grammatical errors .	Opposed	Nov 15 2022 11:02AM
---------	--------	---	---	---------	---------------------------