



Memorandum

To: Redevelopment Commission
From: Craig Lewis, Office of Civic Investment
Re: Amendments and Edits to the Civic Master Plan
Date: May 3, 2013

We have compiled a list of the following edits and requests for changes/amendments to the draft Civic Master Plan document from continued internal review and the following public workshops/presentations:

- March 20, 2013 – Presentation the Neighborhood Association Leaders (~30 attendees)
- April 3, 2013 – Presentation to the Planning Commission
- April 11, 2013 – Sector 2 Workshop (~50 attendees)
- April 12, 2013 – Sector 3 Workshop (~24 attendees)
- April 22, 2013 – Sector 4/5 Workshop (~18 attendees)
- May 1, 2013 – Citywide Workshop (~48 attendees)

CH 1A Civic Vision Enabled

Recommended Changes

- Make sure that these opportunities are well noted as conceptual throughout – Need to include a very big disclaimer that the images are conceptual depictions only of one of a number of potential development/redevelopment opportunities. Something along the lines that they are intended to show appropriate bulk and scale and general arrangement only. Final plans are subject to zoning and subdivision rules.
- This plan is intended to:
 - Anticipate future development
 - Sustainably plan for necessary civic/public infrastructure improvements and prioritize such improvements to leverage private development/redevelopment where possible
 - Identify key development/redevelopment areas that require special attention by the RDC (need to be clear in text, maps and tables which are expected to happen on their own and which may require some RDC assistance/intervention/prodding/leadership)
- Add a Text Box (half page) about “How to use this Plan”
- Section 1.3 (p.12) - Include the Air Station in the description of section 4 since we are adding text about other institutions such as TCL in other sectors. (MCAS)
- Section 1.3 (p.13) – Include the Air Station included in the map of Sector 4? (MCAS)
- Section 1.4 (p.19) - The Development Opportunities Map for Sector 4 shows the parcels across Hwy 21 from the Air Station. While they are certainly in the proximity of the Commerce Park, those are Air Station owned because the Clear Zone for our primary runway covers large portions of the two southern parcels, and the most northern parcel is in a high noise zone. (MCAS)



Other Outstanding Issues

- None

CH 2 The Public Waterfront

Recommended Changes

- P 27 Remove “on public and private property” – (note: the definition of these public and private strategies can be found at the bottom of pg 28)
- P 27 Principle 8 - “Albergotti”
- Remove illustration of Marina – replace with second alternative?
- P 45 Amend caption for North End Neighborhood waterfront illustration to include as a generic illustration showing waterfront access in a single family neighborhood

Other Outstanding Issues

- None

CH 3 Celebrating and Expanding the Downtown

Recommended Changes

- P 64 Remove USCB illustration – redundant from other section
- P 65 Include new logo scheme from Main Street Beaufort
- Show current Bladen Street Redevelopment District boundaries
- P 59 Remove plan of Post Office redevelopment
- P 60 Remove illustration of Post Office Block
- P 61 Do not color Courthouse in plan

Other Outstanding Issues

- P 55 Amend illustration of liner building illustration – need direction (Also P 56?)
- P 61 Amend plan of Bladen Street Infill – need direction (all detached buildings?) – perhaps provide 2 options – current plan is compliant with Bladen Street code
- P 61 Amend illustration of Bladen Street infill to reflect plan changes/options

CH 4 Protecting and Expanding Natural Infrastructure

Recommended Changes

- P 71 Make sure the green infrastructure is constrained to the park parcels and does not include private land (e.g., Verdier Road)
- P 71 Add consideration of the Marshier Farm tract as part of the natural infrastructure inventory as a passive park along the Spanish Moss Trail (Rural and Critical Lands inventory)
- Washington Street park on page 73 - remove both references to tennis court
- P 79 Adjust plan drawing to move homes off of park property and adjust illustration on P 80 reflect the plan – Be sure to note in the text the importance of having homes fronting the park but noting that the current planning indicates that these would need to be on private property unless the current arrangement with BJWSA is amended to permit non-public use
- P 83 Make sure that plan and illustration for Sams Point Park show the same thing (remove street from illustration)



- P 84 Note Marshes Farms tract as a possible urban agriculture site

Other Outstanding Issues

- P 79 Need to get direction on which plan will be presented in this document. It seems as though there should be two or three phases of park development depicted.
- Power lines - what should we include in the plan as part of tree protection?

CH 5 Community Mobility at our Speed

Recommended Changes

- Replace picture on pg 92 because there is no skateboarding allowed in the park. Sorry girls : (
- P 96 – Amend language in Section 5.2 the note “Special places along the trail are expected to be energized with trail users and present opportunities for new trail-focused retail (e.g., bicycle rentals and sales, coffee/drink shops), recreational amenities (e.g., small parks and playgrounds), and programmed activities (e.g., races, festivals) consistent with their context.” (Note: cross reference Section 8.3 Beaufort Plaza and 9.1 Depot Area)
- P 96 Add trailhead at Beaufort Plaza in diagram
- P 104 Remove Marsh Road/TCL/BMH segment from New Street Connection diagram
- Section 5.6 (p.105) – Need to make sure that we're making it clear that additional connections and streetscape improvements called for on/around Shanklin Rd are encouraging compatible (as opposed to residential) development. (MCAS)
- Encourage a multi-use path along 170 in the trees – currently shown in section on p. 245
- Consider future of Old Jericho Road as a multi-use path?

Other Outstanding Issues

- Transit? Perhaps add something to Ch 5?
- Don't understand why we need two crossings of the trail in the Depot area at Hay and Middleton – need to be sure to limit truck traffic into the neighborhood if these are formally opened as public streets

CH 6 A City of Walkable Neighborhoods

Recommended Changes

- P 131 Retirement Village on Harvey Property and adjacent - Section 8 apartments – where are the current residents going (need to clarify that the city is not moving anyone)
- P 133 North End neighborhood – Show a variety of options for the Salzer/Marsher Farm tracts consistent with the current zoning (R-1 and R-1 cluster) – Replace current R-2 drawing with options showing development at current zoning density but provide a cluster alternative as well (same number of homes but smaller lots and more open space) and remove illustration
- P 134/135 – Only south side is dilapidated but change term to “aging and outdated” and remove redevelopment plans from Cedar Grove area (currently condos in good condition) – remove or adjust illustration accordingly
- P 138 Amend/adjust Southside Park illustration in accordance with those in CH 4 (move housing off of park property)
- P 147 Amend illustration of Sam's Point Road Park to reflect plan (larger)



Other Outstanding Issues

- Look at Polk Village and integrating it into the city
- P 142 & 143 Should we remove Burton neighborhood that is not in city limits (Battery Creek HS area)

CH 7 A City of Grand Civic Institutions

Recommended Changes

- P 151 Add “Military” to goal statement
- P 153 Adjust USCB plan drawing to remove apartments and crop image on P 154 accordingly
- P 159 Remove road stub from BMH MOB to Allison and curve trail around marsh to tie back to the SMT greenway
- P 158-159 Need to be clear about how this plan is implemented relative to the hospital expansion in absence of a master plan from BMH – will they be held to the same pattern and character as depicted in the plans and drawings – Revise conceptual plan to include TCL’s plan and “loosen up” the plan around the hospital (two phases?). Continue to work with the hospital to improve the overall character of the corridor by setting basic parameters along the street edge and allowing for flexibility internal to the site

Other Outstanding Issues

- Be sure to keep the valuable services within the neighborhood (DHEC) – Comp Plan issue
- Look at how to include Beaufort High School (with possible improvements) and the Crystal Lake area
- Add something about future schools in Section 7.5?
- Continue to meet with BMH to get some direction about their future expectations and master plan.

CH 8 Mixed-Use Corridors of Economic Activity

Recommended Changes

- P 169 - #5 'will be pursued' not 'with'
- P 171 – “SC 802” – remove 1 at the end
- P 173 - Roundabout at Bay and Ribaut – remove fifth leg and relocate image to P 230 as concept for future consideration as part of a larger corridor plan
- P 180-185 - Make sure the Robert Smalls village is noted clearly as being a 100 year illustrative to depict over the long term that this area could be redeveloped as a full village center – use the commercial strip alternative in the overall plan drawing
- P 181 – Need to note preservation of Jericho Road – convert to median divided Avenue or multi-use path
- P 184 - Redraw plan to respect character of Old Jericho Road behind Gray tract (original route to Parris Island – possibly historic/scenic)
- P 185 - be sure to label Parris Island Gateway
- P 188 - Adjust the image so the Village Center is not split at the page break

Other Outstanding Issues



- Make sure that the Lady’s Island plans are coordinated with the County (Note: the road networks and open space have been coordinated with the County planning to date)

CH 9 Districts for Economic Development Activity

Recommended Changes

- Write out AICUZ in Principle 5 on pg 193
- Be sure to emphasize that the Depot area is not intended to be another commercial center – but rather an industrial area that is compatible with the neighborhood (very limited retail – no bars, nightclubs or restaurants)
- Section 9.0 (p.194) - Remove the three parcels across Hwy 21 from the Air Station is in keeping with the goal of the map. (MCAS)
- P 194 - Remove air station-owned parcels along 21
- P 195 Adjust language in 9.1 to identify short and long term vision. Also wording in last sentence of 2nd paragraph should start “Over time this area is expected to transform. One vision is as an industrial arts district ... In addition, with the major amenity of the Spanish Moss Trail running through the middle of it, it is appropriate that certain neighborhood-friendly, trail-supportive uses find a home here to support the thousands of weekly trail users.” (Cross reference 5.2)
- Section 9.3 (p.198) - I think it is very important to make it clear that the City (and County within their boundaries) enforces the zoning in the AICUZ/Airport Overlay District and the FAA permits building heights next to air fields. The DoD via Dept of the Navy, via HQ Marine Corps, via Marine Corps Installation East, via Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort assembles and communicates the AICUZ data. (MCAS)

Other Outstanding Issues

-

CH 10 Regulating Plan

Recommended Changes

- P 230 Ribaut Rd diagram and underlying map are offset
- P 231 – Clarify language to pass these general principles on to future generations when they finally are able to develop a comprehensive plan for Ribaut Road
- P 231 and 232 – Remove Ribaut Road sections – too confusing
- P 233 Boundary Street diagram and underlying map are offset
- P 244 Fix Section to remove on-street parking but keep bike lanes – do not reduce current median width

Other Outstanding Issues

-

CH 11 Project Implementation

Recommended Changes

- Project 1-R Sycamore Street – verify cost (probably missing a zero)
- P 257 Project 2D should be “TCL/BMS Marshfront Trail” not parallel road



- P 264-273 Add a column that identifies which development/redevelopment opportunities are expected to happen on their own over time (most of the drawing area) or have been previously permitted with a PUD (e.g., Trask-multiple, Marsh Gardens) and which may require RDC attention (much smaller list generally confined to publicly owned land)
- Section 11.1 Recolor/re-categorize Civic Infrastructure project boxes

Other Outstanding Issues

- Water and sewer lines - how have these been accommodated?

Appendix

Recommended Changes

- Add current AICUZ over CMP composite map along with brief narrative that the AICUZ is expected to change later in 2013 to become “fatter” in the middle (encroach into Burton) and less “long” (not extend to Habersham)

Other Outstanding Issues

-

Additional Unfiled/General Comments

- Concerns about gentrification in the NW Quadrant – the City/RDC should put money and resources into stabilizing the existing housing
- General concern about illustrations being misleading or not representative of “Beaufort-scaled” development
- Concern about the illustrations/plan being a smoke screen for the new code
- Can we remove the illustrations and make it a bullet-point document with statements of principles/goals?
- “Why is my neighborhood broken and why do we think that this is the answer?”
- “This isn’t for us and it’s only about producing revenue”
- Density depicted is too high for Beaufort and will unduly impact the infrastructure – “believe that this is a bait and switch”
- Want Sector 2 to remain a small quiet neighborhood
- Note that SCE& G is going to demolish their building in the Depot area and replace it with expansion of equipment and truck storage (need to confirm)
- Need to have a plan to address the current traffic problems from Beaufort Elementary
- The input from the public is critical and the drawings need to be scaled back to what is “Beaufort”
- Neighborhood commercial is complicated
- The Old Point is approximately 10-12 units but many lots have been subdivided so that the guest quarters of the original main house are now a separate property
- It looks like this plan is about only housing – what about attracting industry (Sector 2 comment)
- The document is confusing to make you way through – why can’t everything be organized by Sector (editor’s note: it is under each broad topic/goal)
- Midtown doesn’t look like Beaufort – it looks too cookie cutter



- Concerned about the city adopting concepts and how those will relate to the code
- Is this plan going to be adopted altogether (editor's note: that is the intention)
- What is the schedule for improvements to Allison Road? (editor's note: submitting grant application and including it in the CIP)
- Concerned about parking behind mixed-use buildings along Allison Road and shining lights into abutting properties (e.g., Oakhaven Street)
- When will the corrected zoning map for Verdier Bluff area be posted? (editor's note: when the committee has completed its review of that area)
- What is the schedule for the new code (editor's note: 9-12 months at a minimum)
- Concerned about "intense density around the city"
- Why was Sector 1 adopted so early?
- There are far more cars in the city – why would we prioritize pedestrians and bicyclists?
- We need to endorse a parking deck for TCL/BMH to avoid more surface parking lots
- Keep expansion of USCB on south side of Boundary Street so the students don't have to cross the road
- "We are a happy group – why should we change?"
- Why are we encouraging moving buildings closer to the street?
- Future Spanish Moss Trail extensions should not be concrete – can we consider different materials for future phases of trail? (comment to be forwarded to Friends of the SMT and the County)
- "I live in Battery Shores and I'll need to drive everywhere anyway"
- Encourage more buildings like IHOP and less like strip malls
- Consider the Spanish Moss Trail as a central stormwater collection system
- We need to have more connectivity and less parking
- Need to make sure the 170 doesn't become the next 278 – don't want that type of sprawl
- Pulling buildings to the streets creates "caves" – city was not settled as an urban place
- Don't think that the current renderings fit Beaufort
- Can the roads handle the doubling of the populations (editor's note: A post development traffic study was not completed as a part of this project that at present there is a lot of excess capacity in many of the roadways through Beaufort at present – with some notable issues at certain intersections - and where we are recommending the largest population increases is where greater population once lived – Sector 1)
- Don't want Ribaut Road to be 3 lanes; There is also concern about making the neighborhoods around Ribaut Road less friendly for cyclists and pedestrians if traffic is pushed off of Ribaut Road and into the neighborhood? (editor's note: as noted previously the plan will not make any specific recommendations regarding the geometric design/laneage for Ribaut – only provide guidance as to key features such as bicycle and pedestrian accommodations for a future, more comprehensive traffic study and plan)
- Will we need a better airport to handle the future population?
- Would the Harvey property have to be rezoned to become a senior living community? (editor's note – it is currently zoned as R-2 that would permit 5 units/acre (85 units) and is surrounded by R-3 at 7 units/acre and GR at up to 25 units/acre)
- Terms "conceptual" and "vision for the future" need to be clarified in terms of the regulatory process; the phrase "basic parameters" is concerning as well



- Is McDonald's really what we would like to see? I don't think that glass and concrete right up on the sidewalks is very "Beaufort."
- In Higginsville, would Section 8 Housing units be removed? There is a concern about sending them out of town.
- Particularly in terms of usage and density, it doesn't make sense to have options that are not permitted under current zoning shown in the CMP. This also doesn't make sense in order to make a "predictable regulatory framework."
- Has the infrastructure for 12,000 more people been considered? How will stormwater be dealt with? (editor's note: Infrastructure will be built to respond to development, generally. We are looking at stormwater best management practices as part of everything that we do (Boundary Street example.)
- With the increased density, why isn't there any mention of transit service? (editor's note: Transit is currently run by the County; the City can help influence this by developing along corridors and creating density that will support future routes.)
- Where did the population estimates come from? (editor's note: This plan relies upon the projections and decisions made in the Comprehensive Plan and the Northern Beaufort County Regional Plan)
- Concern expressed about whether the Civic Master Plan is actual or conceptual because the Boundary Street project is taking my house.
- Is there an economic analysis element to the Civic Master Plan so that we know how much revenue will be brought in by this new development? Will an economic analysis firm do this? (editor's note: That is not part of the scope of this project, though we know from previous analysis by the City that certain types and locations of development are money generators. This plan is consistent with the state requirement for identifying priority investments.)
- Do we know if this plan will, overall, cost us money or make us money? (editor's note: We know that serving people with our existing infrastructure is less expensive than annexing and serving people further outside of the city. Many projects will pay for themselves; there are places where civic investments will be made, and part of this process is to strategically identify these.
- Why are moving the Civic Master Plan along for adoption before finishing the new zoning code? (editor's note: Zoning is an implementing tool, and it will take guidance from this plan, as required by state law and general practice.)
- It seems like the entire Civic Master Plan is predicated on the adoption of a form-based code. A question that I've been asked many times is, "are we reopening Sector 1"? Are we looking at Sectors 2-5 in isolation from the heart of the city? (editor's note: Sector 1 has already been adopted and integrated into the larger plan though we are making some tweaks based on public comments)
- Are you taking Boundary Street (from Bellamy Curve to Ribaut Road) down to two lanes? When the bridge closes because of boat traffic, there is a traffic problem all of the way down Carteret Street. What will you do for parking to supplement the on-street parking, since on-street parking will not be sufficient?
- How has the Seth Harry report influenced the Civic Master Plan? Do his credentials support his completing this sort of study, given that he is an architect and planner? (editor's note: This was a retail-focused study to identify gaps in the current market, particularly the downtown)
- Merchants in downtown saw their revenue drop after parking meters were installed. Aiken, Georgetown, and Camden, South Carolina are all great towns that don't have parking meters. It hurts the merchants and drives customers away. What is the tradeoff between the amount of revenue



brought in by parking meters versus the business that it drives away? (editor's note: Records show that revenue from business licenses have doubled in that time frame.)

- Do conceptual plans damage the future property value? (Specifically in reference to Carolina Cove, a condominium development where Belt Buckle Park is shown.) The difference between conceptual and real development as shown in the plan needs to be clarified and carefully considered.
- The intensity of lighting on Duke Street where it has been redone has a huge positive effect on how safe I feel – especially compared to walking on Carteret Street at night. How soon does concept become real? Putting better lighting in would also help with the parking situation in downtown, because people would feel safer parking a few streets over.
- There is a contradiction between the plan on Boundary Street, where the center lane is being planted (made into a median), versus on Ribaut Road where there is a center lane being put in to help emergency traffic flow.
- Are there any existing manifestations of these concepts that we can see? (editor's note: Great planning has been done all over the world. In South Carolina, both Charleston and Greenville are examples of using great planning to revitalize their cities and improve their neighborhoods)
- We are putting Beaufort up for sale.
- I am moving to Duke Street, and I am excited about the fact that you have a plan – because I come from a place where they build 600 houses and then try to come up with a plan. I am excited about the plan, and about the future.
- It would be good if we could at least put something about the future of storm water management in the plan (and also in the Code.) (editor's note: See section 4.17)