

**Minutes of the Planning Board
Regular Meeting - Electronic
February 9, 2023**

Members Present: Andrea Martin, Barbara Cromar, Tamara Peacock, Samantha Jamison, Neil Brown, Peter Hanley, Jon Blatt (Vice-Chair), Jim Robertson (Chair)

Members Absent: Yolanda Robinson

Staff Present: Lew Holloway, Director of Community Development, Matthew Manley, Planning Manager and Tyler Morrow, Planner II

I **Call to Order.** *The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm. A quorum was established.*

II **Approval of Agenda.** *The Chair added Public Comment to the Agenda prior to New Business. Mr. Brown moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hanley and passed unanimously.*

III **Approval of Minutes for the meeting of October 10, 2022.** *Mr. Hanley moved to approve the Planning Board minutes of the meeting of December 2022 with the addition of Samantha Jamison's name to the attendance role. The motion was seconded by Ms. Cromar and passed unanimously.*

IV **Public Comment.** Attendees were offered the opportunity to make general comments and given 3 minutes to speak.

Gale Fortner of Greenville Highway spoke in opposition to the proposed development at 1202 Greenville Highway.

V **Old Business**

V(A) **Election of Officers**

The sitting Chairman, Jim Robertson, was nominated and approved to continue to serve as Chairman. Nomination by Mr. Brown, Second by Mr. Hanley.

For Vice Chair, Tamara Peacock was nominated and approved to serve. Nomination by Mr. Brown, Second by Mr. Hanley.

VI **New Business**

VI(A) **Standard Rezoning – Signal Hill Rezoning - R-20 to R-15 (P23-06-RZO).** Staff gave a 12-minute presentation on the request and reviewed the guidance from the Comprehensive Plan as well as the criteria for considering a rezoning. Planning Board asked questions related to application of zoning and subdivision standards should development occur on the subject property. In total Planning Board considered this item for 35 minutes.

The applicant spoke in favor of the petition:

Travis Fowler, First Victory, Inc. – shared thoughts on the slight change in density. He stated that the intent of the rezoning is to reduce the cost of development to bring down the overall price of the housing.

Other public comments include the following:

Dwayne Haynes, adjoining property owner – stated that the area at the rear of the property is swampy, wet, low-lying area.

Lynne Williams, Chadwick Ave – appealed to the applicant to preserve as many trees as possible and to replant as much as possible.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton St – raised concerns related to lack of information related to development of the subject property and loss of habitat.

Ashley Clouse, 33 Amazing Grace Ln – asked questions about access to the subject property.

Kristie Gillam – 90 Lafollette Ln. – asked questions about the specific change in density. It was answered that the rezoning increases max unit count by approximately 16. She also asked questions about the condition of the access roads and existing septic in the area. She explained that there is City water in the area but many of the existing units are on septic.

The public comment was closed.

The Planning Board had interest in eventually knowing what type of development would take place on the subject property and looked forward to seeing the site plan at some point in the future. However, they understood that as a standard rezoning the question before them simply related to the appropriateness of the rezoning from R-20 to R-15.

Mr. Hanley 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 properties (PINs: 9579-07-6259; 9579-06-5791; 9579-06-7975; 9579-06-8507; 9579-06-8308; & 9579-06-8117) from R-20 (Low Density Residential) to R-15 (Medium Density Residential) based on the following:

1. The petition is found to be consistent with the City of Hendersonville 2030 Comprehensive Plan based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

The High Intensity Neighborhood & Medium Intensity Neighborhood designations call for Single Family Residential as a primary land use and the proposed zoning district permits single-family & two-family residential uses.

2. We [find] this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- 1. The proposed zoning district is compatible with the surrounding area because it permits the same land uses as the existing zoning district.***
- 2. The petition provides for a marginal increase in density in close proximity to a wide range of commercial uses.***
- 3. The petition would potentially provide additional housing that would utilize existing infrastructure.***
- 4. The petition creates the opportunity for compatible infill development***

Mr. Blatt seconded the motion. The vote was 8 in favor and 0 opposed. Motion passed.

VI(B) Subdivision Text Amendment: Changes to Expedited and Minor Subdivisions (P22-112-STA) The Staff gave a presentation on the request and reviewed the guidance from the Comprehensive Plan as well as the criteria for considering a text amendment. In total, the Planning Board considered this item for 38 minutes.

The applicant, John Lively, spoke in favor of the proposal. He discussed the fact that he was unaware of the changes to the Subdivision Ordinance and how it affected his ability to subdivide his property.

One member of the public spoke and asked questions related to the development:

1. Lynne Williams, Chadwick Ave – concerned about use of additional housing for short-term rentals and environmental impacts.

Ms. Peacock moved move Planning Board recommend City Council adopt an ordinance amending the official City of Hendersonville Subdivision Ordinance, Section 2.04. Review Procedures by revising subsection F. Expedited subdivision and subsection. I. Minor subdivision, based on the following:

1. The petition is found to be consistent with the City of Hendersonville 2030 Comprehensive Plan based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

The petition aligns with the Comprehensive Plan's goals to Promote compatible infill development (Strategy PH-1.1.) and to amend zoning and/or subdivision standards to require and/or offer incentives for variation in lot sizes. (Action PH-2.1.1.).

2. We find this petition, in conjunction with the recommendations presented by staff, to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

1. ***The proposed text amendment creates flexibility for property owners while still limiting potential impacts to the greater community.***
2. ***The proposed text amendment removes additional obstacles to accomplish less impactful infill developments.***
3. ***The proposed text amendment could create opportunities for additional housing stock to***

Ms. Jamison seconded the motion. The vote was 8 in favor and 0 opposed. Motion passed.

VII. Other Business
VII(A) Discussion of Affordable Housing Terminology

VIII Adjournment – *The meeting was adjourned at 5:46 pm.*



Jim Robertson, Chair



Date