

**Minutes of the Planning Board
Regular Meeting
January 15, 2026**

Members Present: Jim Robertson, (Chair), Lauren Rippy, Donna Waters, Betsey Zafra, Bob Johnson, Mark Russell, David McKinley

Members Absent: Kyle Gilgis, Tamara Peacock (Vice-Chair), Laura Flores

Staff Present: Matthew Manley, Long Range Planning Manager, Lew Holloway, Community Development Director, Sam Hayes, Planner II, Hannah Slyce, Planner II

I Call to Order. *The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. A quorum was established.*

II Approval of Agenda. *Ms. Waters moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Rippy and passed unanimously.*

III Approval of Minutes for the meeting of December 11, 2025. *Mr. Johnson moved to approve the Planning Board minutes of the meeting of December 11, 2025. The motion was seconded by Ms. Zafra and passed unanimously.*

IV Other Business

IV(A) Election of Chair and Vice-Chair. *Mr. Johnson made a motion to nominate Jim Robertson as Chair for another year and Tamara Peacock as Vice-Chair for another year. Ms. Waters seconded the motion which passed unanimously.*

IV(B) Presentation Regarding General Obligation Bond for Transportation.

Brian Pahle, Deputy City Manager gave a presentation to the Planning Board on the City of Hendersonville GO Bond Transportation. No action by the Planning Board was taken.

V Old Business

VI New Business

VI(A) Conditional Zoning District – 1207 Kanuga Road Rezoning (25-93-CZD) Mr. Manley gave the following background:

Mr. Manley stated this a CZD application that came before you a month or so ago as a standard rezoning that included three other properties. Now this is the sole applicant and the sole property that will be considered for the rezoning and it is also a conditional rezoning rather than a standard rezoning. Previously under the standard rezoning they were asking for C-4 and if it had been approved, they would have been awarded all the rights that are available under C-4. In this case with the conditional rezoning, if it's approved, they would only be awarded the rights of what they are asking for and what they have shown on their site plan. This would be binding and that is how it is different from a standard rezoning.

Mr. Manley stated the applicant is Greg Grooms with Blue Pinnacle Homes. The site is .81 acres. It is currently zoned R-15. The proposed zoning would be C-4 CZD, Conditional Zoning District. The Future Land Use Designation is Family Neighborhood Living.

A Neighborhood Compatibility Meeting was held in early December and was very lightly attended. There was some discussion around flooding and potential stormwater issues. There were some general questions about what is being proposed. There were also some pre-submitted public comments that were favorable and some stated opposition.

Site photos were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The site plan was shown and discussed in detail and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The developer proposed conditions were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

City proposed conditions that have been agreed to were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The Future Land Use map was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

General rezoning standards for Comp Plan Consistency were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

A draft Comprehensive Consistency statement was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A draft reasonableness statement for approval and denial was included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Manley stated if a motion for approval is made and to give guidance if the Future Land Use Designation is found to be inconsistent, there's an additional paragraph to the motion that gives guidance on what the property should be amended to in the Future Land Use Map so that it would be consistent.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Johnson stated on Kanuga Road, if you were to require sidewalks to be put in, there's no sidewalk to connect to. Are there other plans to do any sidewalks at any point on Kanuga? Mr. Manley stated there would be, as part of the currently unfunded project that was proposed for Kanuga Road, that was originally identified and scored highly enough to be funded by NCDOT in their spot process to develop the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP), which is the funded projects that will be constructed over a five to ten year period. After it was deemed to be funded in a worthy project, backlash from the community and the surrounding area resulted in that being defunded essentially. If and when a project is funded and constructed it would include sidewalks along Kanuga as part of the state's commitment to complete streets. They have a policy that requires that they provide those pedestrian, and in some cases, bicycle facilities as part of their funded projects. At some point in the future, and that's the DOT road, the city also can enter into an encroachment agreement with the Department of Transportation to construct sidewalks in their right-of-way, or to acquire right-of-way and install sidewalks. That's much more likely to happen on King Street, as Mr. Pahle highlighted, to fill the gaps in our most walkable areas. This would not be a near-term type of priority at this location given some of the other constraints. That is just him somewhat speculating. Also based on our pedestrian plan, where we've highlighted the projects and prioritized projects and State Street leading to this intersection was identified as a project, and a portion of that is a city project and then it transitions to NCDOT. So yes, there are plans for sidewalks to be built at this intersection. The reality is,

transportation projects are extremely expensive and there are finite amount of resources and there are wide ranging needs. Congestion projects get as much, if not more, of the funding than safety projects and that is taking that pool of resources and spreading it pretty thin.

A question was asked concerning the blocking of the driveway and allowing for emergency access. Mr. Manley explained that the Fire Marshal would review the site plan and a more detailed site plan would have to be submitted as the final site plan.

Mr. Manley stated so they are basically required to construct or pay a fee in lieu for the linear frontage from property line to property line on both Kanuga and Drake Street per the ordinance. The developer is asking that they either build or pay a fee in lieu for this portion only and that they not be required to build or pay the fee for Kanuga. It would be up to them to make a case for why that allowance should be provided. Mr. Johnson stated so right now they just don't want to do it and they are asking us to waive it. Mr. Manley stated correct.

Discussion was made on the options for the sidewalk. Chair asked what the payment per linear foot was. Mr. Manley stated it is \$130.00 per linear foot. Mr. Manley stated the footage along Kanuga is 209 feet and along the north is 222 feet.

Chair asked if the C-4 application went to City Council. Mr. Manley stated it did not.

Discussion was made on the current zoning and why they chose to go with C-4 CZD as the zoning. It was stated the paint and body shop was a legal nonconforming use.

Chair asked how many units would be permitted on .81 acres under the current zoning. Mr. Manley stated there could be six units. Chair stated by right there could be six dwelling units on this property. Mr. Manley stated yes. Chair stated this is being proposed as four units with one office space. Mr. Manley stated correct.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if the applicant would like to address the Board.

Greg Grooms stated he is the owner operator of Blue Pinnacle Homes. He introduced himself and gave a quick background. He stated he would like to start by discussing the traffic pattern and that he drives this every day and is familiar with it. There are two main functions they are trying to achieve here. One is convert the current structure into an office. He has started his homebuilding company here in the area. They have been going for about four years now. They grew a lot the past year and it led him to hiring employees which had to get them out of his living room. They looked for something that was close by with good visibility and they purchased this property with the intent of converting it to an office. They bought it very overgrown, definitely had not been cared for and they have been working to clean it up since they bought it. Their intent is to bring the overall site to a level of beautification.

Mr. Grooms stated the second phase would be the condo additions. They would start by demoing the garage. The shed that runs along the property line would come out also. Realistically their intent is probably not to start this project, Phase II right away. The initial intent was to purchase the property for the sole reason of having an office. He stated the impervious is currently at 6% and then, of the overall site and with the improvements and the addition of the condo units, that new impervious would be at 29%, leaving a green space of still 71% on the site. He stated Mr. Manley mentioned that there's a 22% of tree canopy prior to the installation of the street trees, so that will dramatically increase with the addition of the street trees and the Type B buffer.

Mr. Grooms showed a number of photos to the Planning Board and explained the proposed project. He discussed the garage removal, the driveway, landscaping and buffering, parking, etc.

Chair asked if anyone had any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Russell asked if there is enough room for parking in front of those units in Phase II. Mr. Grooms stated he really thinks there will be. The more they angle the condos the more opportunity they will have there. His intent is to have a parking spot in front. They will have a single car garage unit and even in the HOA documents, he will have requirements that you can't have over two vehicles. You will have to utilize one of your garage parking spots as one of your parking spots and then one in the driveway.

Chair asked if the rock wall extends around the corner and goes up Drake Street. Mr. Grooms stated it does. Chair stated it seemed like he was asking for relief of the sidewalk on Kanuga because of the rock wall, but the rock wall goes up Drake Street too. Chair asked why he was asking for it on Kanuga but not on Drake. Mr. Grooms stated he doesn't think the rock wall is primarily the issue. It is a factor, but he thinks because it is a lower rock wall and it is not dealing with the ditch as much as Kanuga, they can still get a sidewalk in there. Drake is a more residential and traveled by foot area anyway. Walking on Kanuga is not recommended. Chair asked if the sidewalks continue up Drake Street. Mr. Grooms stated there is no sidewalk there. It would be a standalone sidewalk on this property.

Mr. Johnson asked if he would consider not doing that sidewalk in lieu of. Mr. Grooms stated he would definitely consider it from a builder's standpoint and cost evaluation. Mr. Johnson stated it is going to take you to no end.

Lew Holloway, Community Development Director explained the sidewalk fee in lieu process.

Discussion was made on the back of the condos and having a deck or patio. Mr. Grooms stated he has not designed the condos yet. He stated it would depend on what is feasible. The stream buffer requirement was discussed concerning the deck. Mr. Grooms stated it would be slab on grade and he discussed the impacts from flooding.

Chair opened public comment.

T.D. King, 116 Carriage Walk Lane stated he wanted to talk as a grandfather. He comes up and down Kanuga Road at least four times every single day of the week. Many times, it is a lot of days more than that. He is a grandfather and so he has school duty in terms of getting his grandkids to school in the morning and bringing them home in the evening. The situation in this general area that we are talking about has gotten out of hand as far as the traffic is concerned. He is actually experiencing getting kids late to school because of the traffic jam that occurs right across from Johnson Farm in this very neighborhood. He thinks it would be very short-sighted to put a double entryway feeding into Kanuga Road, right where one left-hand turn backs up traffic. He is totally opposed to making this traffic situation worse and this will make it worse. His second point is he is opposed to the addition of these four additional units. He thinks these four units would be totally out of character with everything up and down Kanuga. He is firmly opposed for a couple of reasons that haven't been discussed.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street stated the Neighborhood Compatibility meeting for this project was productive and is reflected in this new site plan. The good things. This is an adaptive reuse of a historic building. Also, the preservation of the magnolia and the oak trees is a very positive feature of the site plan and of the conditions that have been proposed. The removal of the ivy is called for and a positive action. The trees that are going to be added are a benefit. The trees that are on Kanuga Road is an asset to the plan and some of our advocates for the trees have been very impressed with that aspect of the plan. The traffic is a major concern. There are many issues about that and the neighbors know more about the

specifics than he does. We do not have any details about the designs for Phase II, what the buildings will look like and that may or may not be an asset or a concern. The parking issue that's been discussed, he thinks it is essential that there be a parking area in that driveway so that there are at least two parking spaces per unit. Stormwater hasn't been discussed, where and how it will go. The other issue is the location of the floodplain. There has been much concern about flooding and what will happen in the future. He discussed the request to remove the transition zone. What is the purpose of the transition zone and what would happen in that zone? How would the proposed deck effect that area? Would there be issues with erosion? Would there be plantings in that area? There was a possibility that they could pipe the stream. What happens at both ends of the pipe when you have flooding events? If you eliminate the streambank in that area, what happens to the water that is in that area? He was concerned about the sidewalks and taking out the wall. He asked about the connection to water and sewer lines and if this would affect the magnolia tree. He discussed open space and that being an inconsistent element. He discussed the character area. The neighborhood character is more residential.

Chair closed public comment.

Mr. Johnson asked where do we stand on this request to not do, leave the fee in lieu of on Kanuga. Chair stated that is a developer requested condition. This is a conditional zoning so the Board could approve it with a different condition and make that recommendation to City Council. The developer could either agree to it or not agree to it right now, but we could send a recommendation to City Council with a different condition.

Chair asked if there could be a condition that the developer pay the fee-in-lieu for both Drake and Kanuga at a different rate. Mr. Holloway stated he would not recommend doing that as your Community Development Director. He doesn't know whether or not that would be legal. He also noted that we establish through the adoption of our budget ordinance, the fee schedule annually and that is based on what the costs are to develop sidewalks. Whether or not you can do that, he would have to ask the city attorney to determine that but from a straightforward perspective he would not recommend that. Mr. Holloway stated the condition could be that you recommend the city work with the developer to construct sidewalks elsewhere.

Discussion was made on the wall and the ditch. Discussion was also made on the destination of the sidewalk and it going nowhere.

Discussion was made on stormwater and making a condition concerning the driveway being pervious or something other than asphalt. Discussion was made on open space.

The traffic issue was discussed.

Mr. Russell left at 5:47 pm.

The character of the neighborhood was discussed. Mr. Manley discussed the Family Neighborhood Living designation.

Mr. Holloway discussed staff's assessment and recommendations. He also discussed the consistency statement and the underlying zoning.

Chair discussed the Board's options for recommendation.

Ms. Waters moved Planning Board recommend City Council adopt an ordinance amending the official zoning map of the City of Hendersonville changing the zoning designation of the subject property (PIN 9568-61-2215) from R-15, Medium Density Residential Zoning District to C-4 CZD,

Neighborhood Commercial Conditional Zoning District for the renovation and reuse of an existing structure for a professional office and construction of four townhomes based on the preliminary site plan and list of conditions (dated 12-31-25) submitted by and agreed to by the applicant and presented at this meeting and subject to the following: 1. The development shall be consistent with the site plan including the list of applicable conditions contained therein and the following permitted uses: one professional office building and four residential dwellings. 2. Permitted uses and applicable conditions presented on the site plan shall be amended to include: 1. Those presented by staff. 3. The petition is found to be consistent with the City of Hendersonville Gen H Comprehensive Plan based on the information from staff analysis and the public hearing and because: The petition for C-4 CZD zoning is consistent with the Future Land Use and Conservation Map Designation of Family Neighborhood Living because of the small scale commercial use and the fact that it is going in an existing residential structure and would maintain that existing character. And the residential units would fall into the current zoning. 4. We find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from staff analysis, public hearing and because: 1. The proposed zoning is compatible with surrounding residential and nonresidential land uses. 2. The proposed zoning allows for a mix of uses at an intersection which experiences significant vehicular traffic. 3. The proposed zoning allows for nodal development with nonresidential uses confined by the floodplains and located along minor arterial roadway. 4. Surrounding low density residential uses primarily front and gain access from local streets. An amendment was made to remove the condition about the sidewalks. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VI(B) Zoning Text Amendment – C-2 Dimensional Standards (25-92-ZTA). Mr. Manley gave the following background:

Mr. Manley stated prior to the downzoning law, the city had the ability to rezone property as it saw fit. Now that has become a lot more complicated and we have had to pivot and kind of find other ways to try to achieve the city's vision. One of those ways has been to modify existing zoning districts rather than come in and rezone them and change the zoning district from one zoning district to another. Instead we are leaving the zoning district as it is but changing all the standards in it in a way that does not meet the definition of downzoning.

A map of the C-2, Secondary Business district was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Manley discussed and pointed out some of the key areas.

The Future Land Use Map was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The proposed amendment was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The Downtown Master Plan was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

General rezoning standards for comprehensive plan consistency were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

General rezoning standards for compatibility were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

A draft comprehensive plan consistency statement was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A draft reasonableness statement for approval and denial was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Chair asked if there was any questions for staff.

Mr. Johnson asked if we are thumbing our nose at the state and doing this. Mr. Holloway stated no and explained the reason behind making this change.

Discussion was made on downzoning and nonconformities.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair opened public comment.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street had concerns about townhomes being permissible in this district and there might be some issues in areas with that. He discussed concerns with the 7th Avenue District.

Chair closed public comment.

Discussion was made on multi-family in C-2. Minor PRD was also discussed.

Mr. Johnson moved the Planning Board recommend City Council adopt an ordinance amending the official zoning code of the City of Hendersonville Article V Zoning District Classification Section 5-7 C-2 Secondary Business Zoning District based on the following: 1. The petition is found to be consistent with the City of Hendersonville Gen H Comprehensive Plan based on the information from staff analysis and because: The proposed amendments align with the Gen H Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use and Conservation Map and Downtown Master Plan. 2. Furthermore we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from staff analysis, public hearing and because: 1. The proposed amendment allows for greater utilization of private property. 2. The proposed amendment creates an opportunity to accommodate infill development. 3. The proposed amendment allows for walkable, urban development. Ms. Rippey seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Holloway introduced Hannah Slyce as the new Planner for the City of Hendersonville.

VII Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 6:18 pm.



Jim Robertson, Chair

