

**Minutes of the Planning Board
Regular Meeting - Electronic
August 8, 2024**

Members Present: Jim Robertson (Chair), Peter Hanley, Tamara Peacock (Vice-Chair), Donna Waters, Laura Flores, Bob Johnson

Members Absent: Barbara Cromar, Beth Robertson, Kyle Gilgis, Chauncey Whiting

Staff Present: Tyler Morrow, Current Planning Manager, Matthew Manley, Long Term Planning Manager, Sam Hayes, Planner, Lew Holloway, Community Development Director

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

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

III(A) **Approval of Minutes for the meeting of July 11, 2024.** *Ms. Waters moved to approve the Planning Board minutes of the meeting of July 11, 2024. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hanley and passed unanimously.*

IV **Old Business**

V **New Business**

V(A) **Conditional Zoning District – Rezoning – First Ave Villas (P24-26-CZD).** Mr. Manley gave the following background:

Ms. Peacock asked that she be recused from this item as she is the architect for the project. A motion was made by Mr. Hanley to accept Ms. Peacock's recusal. Ms. Flores seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Manley stated they are waiting to hear from Legal on whether Ms. Peacock could participate or not. Mr. Manley stated they are checking on whether Ms. Peacock can participate for her client.

Mr. Manley stated this came before the Board last month. He also stated we now have a new Comp Plan that has been adopted. There have been changes made to the building between last Planning Board and this Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Manley stated this is a CZD/rezoning that is amending a currently zoned CMU CZD, a site on First Avenue which is a .57 acre tract. They are modifying the site plan that was tied to that approval so they are going back through the rezoning process but the zoning would stay the same. The approved site plan would be modified if this is approved. The proposal is for a 16 unit multi-family development that comes out to 28 units per acre. The new Future Land Use designates it as Downtown Character Area.

A Neighborhood Compatibility Meeting was held on June 6th. This was also presented to Planning Board last month as well. Topics discussed were affordability for current residents, gentrification and

displacement of residents, property tax increases, parking, massing, density and height, and architecturally incompatibility

Site photos were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Manley showed photos of other developments in the area and the height of those for multi-family and mixed use.

The previous rezoning was explained and is included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Manley stated this is the fifth time in four years that this site has come before the Planning Board. It was approved on two separate occasions. A total of 11 units have been approved and is tied to the CZD that is approved today.

A revised site plan was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

There were some outstanding comments which in staff's opinion are not deal breakers. They are all items that would have to be addressed should this move on to final site plan approval. They have been noted and put into the record. Mr. Manley discussed each of these which are included in the staff report and presentation.

Previous elevations and revised elevations were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation.

There are no developer proposed conditions.

The city proposed conditions were addressed and are included in the staff report and presentation. Those were in order to reduce unreasonable loss of privacy, the existing vegetation on the east property edge should be fully preserved. [Developer has not agreed]. Alternatively, remove balconies/patios facing external to site and relocate to courtyard (interior of site). [Developer has not agreed].

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

The new Current Land Use and Zoning map was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The general rezoning standard and comprehensive plan consistency was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. City proposed conditions were read into the record and included in the staff report and presentation.

A Comprehensive Plan Consistency Statement was shown and is included in the staff report.

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

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Johnson stated the structure is requiring the people who live there to park on public streets, is that a typical thing to do? Mr. Manley stated it does not require them, they are meeting the minimum parking requirement on-site. Mr. Johnson stated in reality, they will have second cars. Mr. Manley stated less than 50% of residents in the City of Hendersonville own two cars. Mr. Johnson stated he does see the privacy issue as a big deal has anybody considered putting baffles or translucent panels on the sides of the balconies. The issue is not only privacy looking out but privacy looking in. Has this been considered as a way to address that issue? Mr. Manley stated that would be a question for the developer.

Chair asked about the clarification concerning Ms. Peacock. Mr. Morrow stated he spoke to Daniel Heyman, Staff Attorney and reading through the City Code and as a rule of thumb it is best if there is

someone else here to present and that Ms. Peacock not present. If there is a question that only Ms. Peacock could answer it would not preclude her from speaking but just as a general rule if there is someone else here to speak, it is best just to have them speak for the project. Chair stated he still has a problem. If a Board member recuses themselves because they are involved and is a conflict, they have always left the room, not presented. Mr. Morrow stated he asked that question as well and these meetings are open to the public and there is nothing saying that she has to leave. She can stay and listen to it as a member of the public.

There were no further questions for staff.

Brian Gulden, attorney for the applicant stated he represents the developer. He stated the developer through the architect did modify the plan based on some of the conditions that Mr. Manley just spoke about. Some of the ones that state the developer has not agreed to, they have tried to adhere to those conditions and satisfy those conditions that the staff has recommended. The second thing he wanted to point out is it is a great new world. The city adopted the Gen H Comprehensive Plan which is different than the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and he would say it is significantly different. It puts this piece of property in that Downtown designated area. There are four categories under the new Gen H Plan. Some of them are living, activity, transitional and this downtown area in that activity category. Activity means we want to improve the mobility of residents in this area. We want them to walk to certain places, we want them to be able to bike to certain places and that would be to grocery stores, downtown activity centers and to the Ecusta Trail, the library and all the other commercial activities. That is different than what was here the last time we appeared before you. Also in the Downtown District they have Downtown Edge Area and that Downtown Edge Area is a little different than the core of the Downtown District. He pointed out one of the interesting aspects of the edge area being that in the Comprehensive Plan it has a minimum height requirement and so the Comprehensive Plan in this Downtown Edge Area of the Downtown District in the activity centers they don't want you to build single story houses. They want at least a minimum of two-stories. They want a minimum height of 22 feet and they propose a maximum height of 40 feet. This new plan accomplishes that by reducing that back bump-up area and it removes those two units that you were seeing the last time. What you were seeing the last time is 18 units and now there are 16 and they have the 19 spaces for parking which are required. There is a tree they would love to save so they can enhance the buffer on the south portion. The Board has some questions the last time about economics and feasibility and this area that this project is in, within that downtown edge talks for compact development. Compact development is an aspect of this downtown edge area within downtown activity centers and states "developers in this compact development can maximize the use of available land particularly where infrastructure capacity already exists and rising real estate values warrant higher levels of investment for reasonable returns". And that goes to the point that you have got this undeveloped, underutilized piece of property as Mr. Manley indicated saying that it was vacant, underutilized, highly suitable for development in an intensity node. Because these compact developments were anticipated and were adopted by City Council on August 1st he believes, last Thursday, it contemplates that the real estate values warrant higher levels of investment for reasonable returns. That is what they have here. They have this infill development where all the infrastructure is already existing and the City of Hendersonville wants these dense, high intensity compact developments. This area is right for that. The fact that the footprint may not have changed, the height changed but the whole governing structure of the City of Hendersonville has changed dramatically in the last week with the adoption of this Gen H Comprehensive Plan. This project is found to be consistent with 90% of the Gen H Plan. He believes any of the inconsistencies found could be addressed with conditions. He wanted the Board to keep in mind last month was the 2030 Comp Plan. This month a blank slate, we are looking at the Gen H Comp Plan. They are no longer looking at the 2030 Plan but looking at the Gen H Plan and from all appearances this plan is consistent with that Gen H Plan. We would ask them to approve it with appropriate conditions.

Chair asked staff when they came up with the conditions that were presented to them today, they were comparing the project to the new Comp Plan, the Gen H 2045 Comp Plan. Mr. Manley stated that is correct.

Sarah McCormick, architect for the project stated she works for Peacock Architects. She stated since the last meeting they have addressed all the comments except for one. They have removed the fourth level of the building bringing the overall height to 38 feet at the absolute tallest point. According to the new code the building is allowed to be 40 feet at the midpoint of the gable but they are only 34 feet. This addressed the issue of maintaining the appropriate scale for the neighborhood. They also updated the façade material from stucco to siding to match the materiality of the neighboring houses. They added operable porch like balconies that contribute to the small town neighborhood feel. They enclosed the stairwell so that it is not visible from the street and added a catwalk between the two stairwells as a secondary means of egress. They moved the loading zone so it is easier to access and connected the sidewalk to the street and the balconies on the front of the building. They also moved the dumpster enclosure so that it is not visible from the street and reduced the back concrete area so that the trees on the existing property line can be preserved. The one condition they did not meet is they did not rotate the buildings to be parallel with the street because it will not fit on the site and it will require demolition of some of those trees on the east property line. They do have a cross parking agreement with the church across the street so they do not have to necessarily park on the street if they have a second car. They did add thicker balusters on the balcony which adds a little more privacy than what they had before. She hopes they take these changes into consideration.

Chair asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Johnson asked if they were doing sidewalks now. Ms. McCormick stated yes, they have agreed to do sidewalks.

Chair stated to get into the lower units you still have to go into the courtyard area. Ms. McCormick showed on the site plan how they can get into the units.

Mr. Johnson asked if they were addressing the privacy issues and revisions. Ms. McCormick stated they tried to address the issues by changing the railing and also by preserving more of the trees than what was shown previously.

Ms. Flores asked about the vegetation on the east side. Ms. McCormick stated they are preserving it all.

Mr. Gulden stated they put the windows on those areas that Mr. Manley had talked about. These new updated site plans were a result of the comments they got back after Mr. Manley reevaluated this under the Gen H Plan. They tried to address all the concerns in the new updated site plans.

Chair stated in order to reduce the unreasonable loss of privacy he asked if they were agreeing to not touch any of the vegetation on the east side. Ms. McCormick stated yes. Chair stated and protect it during the construction. Ms. McCormick stated yes and up on the screen she had a study of the house they had done next door and it is 60 feet away from their property line and the trees are taller than their building. Chair stated and remove the balconies and patios that are facing the external site and relocate them to the courtyard to the interior of the site. Are you verbally going to agree to that for now as well?

Rafique Charania, developer with ARY Development stated virtually it is not possible because they had to restructure the whole thing. To preserve the privacy they can add a one sided glass on the balconies where you cannot see through to the other side. The trees are over 60 feet tall anyway so there is no privacy issue if they do not take those out. On the west side the house is further away as compared to the east side. It is not much of an issue on the west side verses the east side. Chair stated this particular

condition is listed because of an ordinance and not because of the Comp Plan. Mr. Charania stated he is willing to take a recommendation and if they have to plant more trees or any kind of privacy thing they are willing to do that. Chair stated this ordinance is subjective so he believes that this Board needs to determine whether this is an unreasonable loss of privacy or not. Mr. Charania stated they are willing to comply with anything that requires to have that privacy. Chair stated but if there is an unreasonable loss of privacy as determined by whom, then they have to follow the ordinance.

Mr. Manley stated this was a condition that staff came up with, they cannot force the developer to do it they have to agree to it. Chair stated but they have to follow the ordinance. Mr. Manley stated they have to follow the ordinance but that could be achieved by other ideas.

The Board discussed the unreasonable loss of privacy. Mr. Charania stated they are willing to do whatever to fix the privacy issue. Ms. McCormick stated the house on the east side they are actually facing the rear of the house and the house on the west side they are actually facing the side and they are not directly looking into each other.

Lew Holloway, Community Development Director stated given the number of conditions and that they have not taken any public comment, does he want to walk through everything and then return to the points of discussion. Chair stated normally when it gets to this point things have been worked out with staff and he does not know why this is being shoved down their throats. Mr. Holloway stated he would not say it is being shoved down their throat. Staff has a responsibility to review the documents and then you all as a Planning Board have the opportunity to review those conditions and determine whether or not you think they are acceptable. Conditions as a rule have to be agreed upon by the developer and City Council. At the end of the day, their job is to review what staff presents and then make a recommendation to City Council based on that review.

Discussion was made on the connection and the balconies. Ms. McCormick pointed out on the site plan that they have met that requirement/condition. Chair stated it does not look inviting to him. Like someone could walk up to it. Mr. Hanley stated it looks alright to him. Mr. Charania stated they are fulfilling the requirement. Chair stated they are agreeing to provide fully functioning upper floor balconies and first floor patios on the front façade with front entrances connected to the right-of-way. Mr. Charania stated yes, that is correct.

Chair stated provide sidewalk connection to the street edge from first floor units and from sidewalks which flank center drive aisle. Mr. Charania stated that is correct.

Chair stated align building façade parallel and they are not agreeing to that. Mr. Charania stated they cannot. He stated the reason they are not agreeing to it is if they have to do that they will have to remove the trees.

Chair stated provide fenestration on front facing façade of rear elevator/stairwell. Mr. Charania stated they did that.

Chair stated enclose the rear and front stairwells in order to better blend with surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Charania stated they did that.

Chair stated the only ones they have not done are aligning with the street and the balconies that look out over the tops of the other houses. Mr. Charania stated again, aligning with the street means they will have to remove the trees in order to do that. Doing both is not possible. He stated concerning the balconies the house is in a different direction and no one can see the house anyway. The east side is covered with the trees and the west side is further over. Chair asked about the unresolved comments. Ms. McCormick

stated the area of land disturbance is not the entire site. It comes out to 19,127 sq. ft. She pointed this out on the site plan.

Chair stated provide calculations for landscaping requirements. In table form, provide the area or length of required buffers, vehicular use area, urban space, etc, and provide the planting calculations required based on the zoning standards, provide the total plantings for each planting requirement. This is unresolved and the Planning Board normally does not have to deal with this. This is normally resolved between city staff and the developer prior to Planning Board. Mr. Manley stated this has been requested from the initial review and they just have not received it. They will have to be compliant with the landscaping requirements should it move to final site plan. If they are thinking bigger picture, is this appropriate, is it consistent, is it compatible in areas where it is not and are the conditions addressing those incompatibilities or inconsistencies, have we covered all the bases here. Will staff make sure the landscaping is done correctly? Yes, you can focus your attention on any areas that you think have been left uncovered and in this case the landscaping yes, we would like to see a table that shows so that we fully understand the areas that need landscaping but if they don't it does not matter because staff will make sure that they have it on there or they will not get a final site plan approval without it. He stated anything unresolved has been moved over into a condition.

Chair stated last month this project was higher density than what was recommend in the Comp Plan but now it meets the new Comp Plan. Mr. Manley stated yes and explained the newer Comp Plan requirements.

There were no further questions for the applicant.

Chair opened public comment. He stated public comment would be limited to three minutes.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street stated the previous assessment of being incompatible remains appropriate. The new drawings are not from the street level perspective. These buildings will be distinctly different from the adjacent neighborhood and its historic character. He stated the parcel is too small for this project. It is impossible to squeeze this market rate condo project onto this parcel without generating irreversible and severe negative impact on the adjacent historic properties and on the neighborhood with its distinctive character and on the lives of the people who live here. He was concerned about parking and safety issues. He was concerned about traffic issues and the removal of trees. He talked about the historic trees on the east side. The character of the neighborhood is not urban and is more the historic small town character of Hendersonville. He stated the denial motions are clear and concise and very much to the point.

Lynne Williams, Chadwick Avenue stated this plan isn't much different than before. She found the Vice-Chair's presence here today was completely inappropriate. The buffers will be disturbed and removing the two units doesn't change how close the setbacks are or the general height. When the buyer bought this land from the local developer they both knew as part of the sale that the lot was site specific. First Avenue already has parking spots that were just put in. She wanted to note that. The ordinance about privacy 18.6.1 unreasonable loss of privacy she does not see that changing and in fact it is even more so now with the faux balconies becoming actual balconies. She stated the dumpsters are now being moved to the rear neighbors. She doesn't see the requirements of 18.6.4.4 being met. She asked them to keep their word and they have already been to six meetings. The neighbors have already said that this infringes. It is outside of the character and will create gentrification. You have already decided and denied this. She did not like this going through the process and then seeing the attorney talk with staff after the last meeting and discuss the Comp Plan about to change. She felt they could change the design to fit anything that is needed. She stated there is no affordable housing here and this will set a precedence.

Katy Gash 705 Ciccone Drive stated their church is a couple of doors down from this area. She stated she had a lot of concerns and still has concerns and wonders how this will impact them as neighbors. These

developers came before them, they presented a plan and they looked at the plan, you guys rejected the plan and gave them some reasons why and some things they had to work on. She wanted to be fair to say they took those recommendations and suggestions and they went and addressed them. Therefore she thinks it is fair to have this meeting today so they can show you how they have tried to take the recommendations into consideration and they want to be good neighbors and she appreciates that. She is not really sure that she is 100% in favor of this project but she does know that here in Hendersonville, we need housing. She wanted to be fair to everyone and say the developers have addressed the issues and if there are others they need to address, this is a process that we go through. She is excited that they will have some new housing options here in Hendersonville. We have to be open and forward thinking. A lot of work went into the Gen H Plan for 2045 and she thinks if this falls in line with that then she doesn't think you can really fault the developers for trying to create a housing option that fits exactly with what the city is looking for. She is glad to see the trees will be maintained. She feels they have tried their best to preserve the privacy. Her main concern from the start is what effect this will have on gentrification. Gentrification to her is improving the area however she just wants to make sure we are mitigating the negative impacts that could happen. She wants to know that her children and the people who live there are able to afford these places.

Alfred King, 105 Fleming stated he has lived here 40 or 50 years. The biggest issue will be parking as far as he is concerned. He knows they say they have an agreement with the church but what happens if the church decides it wants to expand and get rid of the parking in years to come. Then they will have to start parking on the streets. Eventually Hendersonville will have to start one waying the parking because there is too much traffic. You can't make it up First Avenue during the Apple Festival. As far as affordability these units are not going to be for locals. They will be just like the units they are putting near the high school. That is the biggest issue. It is not going to be affordable and there is an issue with parking. Does it match the neighborhood?

No one on zoom spoke.

Chair closed public comment.

Chair stated they needed to determine this loss of privacy thing first. Because the ordinance would make the developer have a condition that they could not, not agree to. This is for the west side and the east side is keeping the buffer. He suggested a condition moving the balconies to the interior. The balconies are on the third story and they are eight feet from the property line. Mr. Manley stated the balconies are between the property line and the structure. They are eight feet from the property line on either side. There is 60 feet from the house to the east.

Melissa Petit, Real Estate Agent for the applicant stated she is familiar with all the properties surrounding this lot. Chair stated they have all been to the property and know where the houses are. Chair stated they had an opportunity to make their presentation and now the Board is having a discussion amongst themselves.

Chair stated they need to determine if there is an unreasonable loss of privacy. It is eight feet from the property line but not the building. Ms. Flores stated but they are adding additional landscaping.

Discussion was made on the house on the west side and the balconies. Mr. Johnson stated baffles and translucent panels could be a solution. Chair stated the project that is currently approved, he sat on front porches with neighbors looking at elevations and there was a lot of objection to that project. It was painstaking to get what we have approved, approved.

Chair asked what kind of landscaping is proposed for that west side. Mr. Manley stated right now they are showing three canopy trees for every 800 feet and there is 160 feet here, so he rounded that up to five

trees. They are two trees short as currently shown. You could work into a condition some type of screening from the balconies that reduces visibility between neighboring property owners and they can work out the details on that.

Mr. Hanley asked what the developer would do if he was standing on the balcony looking down. Mr. Charania stated if he was standing there looking down that house is 75 feet away from the property. The first thing he is looking at is the driveway and the side of the house. A photo was shown of the house. Mr. Charania described what they would see. He stated there would always be a privacy issue because it is a condensed neighborhood.

Discussion was made on the street view and what you see looking at from the proposed structures over to the house.

Chair stated he still feels they need to determine this loss of privacy thing because any condition will depend on whether they feel there is a loss of privacy. Mr. Hanley stated it is a subjective loss of privacy at best. Chair asked if that was their job. Mr. Manley stated he believes they would be conveying that is if they placed conditions. From what he is hearing it sounds like they don't think that is an issue on the east side but it sounds like there are concerns on the west side and those concerns reflect some level of consensus on their being some level of loss of privacy.

Chair asked Ms. McCormick how difficult it would be to flip the floor plan on one of the buildings and put those balconies on the interior on the west side. Mr. Charania stated there is an elevator and stair structure so that is physically not possible and the second thing is when you buy a property in a downtown location you want to see the outside view. You want to see the sun rise and the sun set, not facing your neighbors looking at each other. It is a design aspect. How would you feel if you buy a condo downtown and you have to see every day on the balcony what your neighbor is doing on their balcony? That is the reason they have those on the outside. Mr. Charania stated it is not design possible. Ms. McCormick stated they would also have to provide a sidewalk on the outside to do this and they do not have enough room to do that and access the units.

More discussion was made on conditions and the solution to the privacy issue.

Mr. Gulden stated Mr. Manley talked about the clustering of the trees in front of those balcony areas would be appropriate and we have been talking about the privacy issues and he is going to read to the Board. (18.6.4.4). Chair stated they have it.

Board members felt like the developer was offering to fix the issues and they could put conditions on the application that would fix it. Mr. Hanley stated there are a lot of solutions to the issues. He stated they will not get final site plan approval if they do not meet the criteria. Chair stated but sometimes this gets to City Council and then nothing looks like what the Planning Board talked about.

More discussion was made on privacy and other neighborhoods.


Ms. Waters concern was they do not have a quorum. Chair stated they do have a quorum. If someone recuses themselves they still have a quorum. Mr. Holloway stated there is no issue with the quorum.

Mr. Hanley moved the 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: 9568-77-1057) from CMU-CZD (Central Mixed Use Conditional Zoning District) to CMU-CZD (Central Mixed Use - Conditional Zoning District) based on the site plan and list of conditions submitted by and agreed to by the applicant, [dated June 28, 2024] 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 Residential, Multi-Family 16 - 2 Bedroom Units 2. Permitted uses and applicable conditions presented on the site plan shall be amended to include: Proposed City-Initiated Conditions [Zoning Compliance]: In order to reduce unreasonable loss of privacy, the existing vegetation on the east property edge should be fully preserved. Proposed City-Initiated Conditions [General Rezoning Criteria]: Provide fully functioning upper-floor balconies and first-floor patios on front façade with front entrances connected to right-of-way. Provide sidewalk connection to street edge from first-floor units and from sidewalks which flank center-drive aisle. Provide fenestration on front facing façade of rear elevator/stairwell. Enclose the rear and front stairwells in order to better blend with surrounding neighborhood. At a minimum use fenestration on street-facing sides to provide light and design consistency. Fenestration on front, street-facing façades should align horizontally throughout the development - i.e. windows on elevator/stairwell should align with windows on residential units. 3(2). The petition is found to be [consistent] with the City of Hendersonville Gen H 2045 Comprehensive Plan based on the information from the staff analysis and because: The petition is consistent with a range of Goals, Guiding Principles and the Future Land Use Designation of Chapter IV of the Gen H Comprehensive Plan. 4 (3). We find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis, public hearing and because: 1.The petition incorporates a mix of housing types into an existing urban neighborhood 2.The petition provides an efficient use of property in the core of the city 3.The petition would place residents within an area of existing city services and infrastructure 4. The petition would place residents within walkable / bikeable proximity of a range of destinations including employment, shopping, and recreation. 5.The petition provides walkable neighborhood design characteristics 6.The petition proposes to have a vibrant interface with the public realm 7. The petition limits the unreasonable loss of privacy on adjacent properties. Chair stated for the purposes of the minutes of the meeting he made sure they had included all of the conditions. He stated they still need to provide a condition concerning the loss of privacy on the west side. Discussion was made on adding something for privacy. Planting three-inch caliper trees were discussed. Chair didn't think trees were the way to do it. **Mr. Hanley added another condition that the west side balconies in the opinion of the Planning Board are subjecting the neighbor to an unreasonable loss of privacy and the ordinance needs to be adhered to.** Chair discussed the pavers in the center and not the parking lot and because of the proximity to Wash Creek he feels like those pavers need to be incorporated throughout all the parking spaces. He discussed oil leaks and water runoff into the creek. If there are pavers this will filter through the soil. **Mr. Hanley added another condition that there are permeable pavers throughout the project for all parking.** Discussion was made on the handicap parking spaces. **Mr. Johnson seconded the motion which passed unanimously.***

VI Other Business

VII Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 5:47 pm.



Tamara Peacock, Vice-Chair